Furman Humanities Review

Volume 30 *April 2019* Article 1

2019

Furman Humanities Review. Volume 30, April 2019

Gretchen Braun Editor
Furman University

furman humanities review

april 2019

furman humanities review

volume 30 april 2019

Furman Humanities Review
Gretchen Braun, Editor

Furman Humanities Review (ISSN 1064-0037), funded in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, annually publishes undergraduate papers in the humanities. According to criteria established by the Endowment, scholarly work from the following disciplines is considered for publication: history; philosophy; languages; linguistics; literature; archaeology; religion; the history, theory, and criticism of the arts; and those fields in the social sciences that employ historical or philosophical approaches.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Gretchen Braun
Furman Humanities Review
Furman University
3300 Poinsett Highway
Greenville, SC 29613

Contributors

Elizabeth Campbell ('18), a History and Politics and International Affairs double major from Knoxville, Tennessee, lives in Nashville and works in government. S

Natalie Curry ('18), of Greensboro, North Carolina, majored in English and is currently a first-year student at Duke University School of Law.

Andrew Golla ('20), of Greenville, South Carolina, is a Religion major and plans to pursue theology at divinity school after graduation. His essay was selected the Meta E. Gilpatrick Award.

Courtney Kratz ('19) is from Maryville, Tennessee. She is completing a triple major in English, Philosophy, and Asian Studies.

Quincy Mix ('19), a History major from Palmyra, Virginia, plans to pursue a career in public relations and strategic communications.

Eli Simmons ('20) is from Greenville, South Carolina. He is majoring in Philosophy and plans to pursue graduate work in the field.

Yunhui Yang ('19) is a History and Japanese Studies double major from Beijing in China. He will pursue graduate study in Regional Studies -- East Asia at Harvard University.

MORITZ'S CURE FOR *LESESUCHT*:
LITERARY CULTURE, READING ADDICTION, AND THE ROLE OF THE PSYCHOLOGICAL NOVEL

Andrew Golla

"These days, one lives and moves within the world of books, and only so few books lead us back to our world of reality."[1] The comment, published by the late eighteenth-century author and intellectual Karl Philipp Moritz in his *Magazin für Empfahrungsseelenkunde*—or the *Magazine of Experiential Psychology*, Germany's first journal of psychology[2]—paints a poignant picture of *Lesesucht*, or reading-addiction, a newly-diagnosable malady sweeping Germany's nation-states at the end of the Age of Enlightenment. The distance between the world of books and the world of reality, especially among impressionable adolescent readers, concerned Moritz both professionally and personally—his semi-autobiographical psychological novel *Anton Reiser*, written between 1785 and 1790 (the same decade as his editorship of the *Magazine*), por-

[1] Sandra Maike Christine Niethardt, "Narration and Consciousness in the Late Eighteenth-Century German Novel," PhD diss. (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2016), 15. Cf. "Man lebt und webt in der Bücherwelt, und nur so wenige Bücher führen uns noch auf unsere wirkliche Welt zurück" (translation mine).

[2] Many scholars leave the name of Moritz's magazine unglossed, perhaps because the term "Empfahrungsseelenkunde" is difficult to translate. This essay will use "experiential psychology"—other translations include "auto-psychology" and "empirical psychology," though the latter can be misleading, as Moritz long predates Freud.

trays Moritz's own struggle with *Lesesucht* through the character of Reiser, who embodies the headache, indigestion, enervation, envy, isolation, and melancholia typical of those reading addicts who could be found equally "in straw-huts and in palaces."[3] In one memorable section of *Anton Reiser*'s second book, the reader encounters a Reiser so addicted to reading that he starves himself, electing to spend what little money he has available to him on a candle and a copy of *Ungolino*, which he reads, alone and freezing, in his bedroom, "forgetting himself and the world."[4]

As a commentary on reading-addiction, *Anton Reiser* offers a unique perspective on the phenomenon of reading-addiction at the end of the eighteenth-century, when the best efforts of the Enlightenment intelligentsia to transform the emergent middle-class into an ideal civil society increasingly conflicted with Germany's ever-expanding popular literary

---

[3] Johann Georg Heinzmann, *Appel an meine Nation über Aufklärung und Aufklärer; über Gelehrsamkeit und Schriftsteller; über Büchermanufakturisten, Rezensenten, Buchhändler; über moderne Philosophen und Menschenerzieher; auch über mancherley anderes, was Menschenfreyheit und Menschenrechte betrifft.* (Bern: s.n., 1795), 450. „...Empfindlichkeit, leichte Erkältung, Kopfschmerzen, schwache Augen, Hitzblattem, Podagra, Gicht, Hämorrhoiden, Engbrüstigkeit, Schlagflüsse, Lungenknoten, geschwächte Verdauung, Verstopfung der Eingeweide, Nervenschwäche, Migräne, Epilepsie, Hypochondrie, Melankolie, die gewöhnlichsten Krankheiten; unsre Lebenssäfte stocken und faulen; häßliche Leidenschaften: Traurigkeit, Unwillen, Mißvergnügen, Eifersucht und Neid, Trotz und Eigendünkel; Müßiggang und Unzucht, findet man in Strohhütten wie in Palästen."

[4] Karl Philipp Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, trans. John R. Russel (Columbia: Camden House, 1996), 111. Cf. Karl Philipp Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologischer Roman* (Verlag: Deutscher Taschenbuch, 1987), 152.

market.[5] The novel explores reading-addiction as not just a sickness of the mind but a sickness of selfhood, a departure from the free, autonomous individuality Kant would describe in his *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*, published in the same year.[6] And thus, *Anton Reiser* can be read as continuing in the footsteps of Enlightenment rationalist social reformers who, like Goethe, viewed the Enlightenment as "critical thinking with practical purpose" and who, like famous pedagogues Lessing and J. H. Campe, wrote and advocated for German-language literature that would guide young readers to construct a rational view of their own selfhood and thereby reach individual and social maturity.[7] *Empfahrungsseelenkunde*, Moritz's brand of rigorous, introspective self-analysis that would serve as the foundation for

---

[5] George S. Williamson, "What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789-1818," The Journal of Modern History 72, no. 4 (2000), 942.

[6] The expression "autonomous, free individual" derives from Immanuel Kant's *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* (1785), which offered a framework for evaluating the moral nature of practical laws according to so-called "categorical imperatives." Kant formulated categorical imperatives by considering the constraints a "pure will" would place on the natural human inclination. This concept of the pure will—belonging to a particular (or individual), driven completely by reason and unfettered by animal desire (a free individual), that dictated law unto itself as "sovereign in the realm of ends" (an autonomous, free individual)—became the characteristic potential of the modern subject as postulated by the German middle-class, allowing it to distinguish itself, in dignity, authority, and moral character, from the other estates.

[7] Henning Wrage, "Jene Fabrik der Bücher. Über Lesesucht, ein Phantasma des medialen Ursprungs und die Kinder- und Jugendliteratur der Aufklärung," *Monatschaft* 102, no. 1 (2010), 2-3. Also Ruth-Ellen Boetcher Joeres, "The German Enlightenment (1720-1790)," in *The Cambridge History of German Literature*, ed. Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 151.

Germany's earliest form of psychology, represented a psychological extension of the *Bildungsprozess*, a process of "education" and "cultivation" illustrated in novels like Wieland's *Agathon* and Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship.*[8] According to the *Bildungsprozess*, selfhood arises out of the tension between inner desires and aspirations and external, social necessities. His or her faculty of rational judgment mediates between the forces of freedom and socialization by creating a distinct, autonomous, reflexive category called the self, and as the individual's self-conception matures across a number of life experiences, he or she lives into a better understanding of how his or her selfhood can serve a particular role in society.[9] Thus Moritz's critique of reading-addiction through the eyes of a psychologist-narrator and his disapproving portrayal of Reiser's infatuation with theatre and popular novels cannot be separated from a social and ideological context that condemned reading-for-reading's-sake and that often used the threat of reading-addiction as a valid excuse for the intellectual

---

[8] Jeffery Sammons, in Jeffery Sammons, "The Mystery of the Missing *Bildungsroman*, or: What Happened to *Wilhelm Meister*'s Legacy?," *Genre* 14, no.2 (1981), argues that the genre-category of *Bildungsroman* is essentially nonexistent, a mythical designation attributed to a scattered assortment of nineteenth-century novels that attempted to incorporate elements of *Wilhelm Meister*'s *Bildung* model in a social context that could no longer imagine the ideal civil society the *Bildung* model existed to create. But despite the contested usefulness of the term *Bildungsroman* for later centuries, the *Bildungsprozess* remains a profitable tool for understanding Enlightenment novels like *Agathon* or *Wilhelm Meister* that employ rational theories of selfhood formation.

[9] Anja Lemke, "Bildung als *formatio vitae*—Zum Verhältnis von Leben und Form in Judith Schalanskys *Der Hals der Giraffe*," *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 41, no. 2 (2016), 395-396 and Sammons, "The Mystery of the Missing *Bildungsroman*, or: What Happened to *Wilhelm Meister*'s Legacy?," 231. See also Goethe's "*Urworte. Orphisch.*"

censorship of the Sentimentality movement—known in Germany as *Empfindsamkeit*—which, according to Campe, relied too heavily on imaginative fancy and therefore modeled a theory of selfhood antagonistic to the self-enclosed, rational, *Bildung* ideal.[10]

But while Moritz's portrayal of reading-addiction does appropriate a kind of rationalist ideology in the eyes of its narrator, this essay will also argue that many formal characteristics of *Anton Reiser*, including Romantic irony and third-person autodiegesis, consciously subvert the *Bildungsprozess*. In order to do so, it will draw on the narratological work of Sandra Niethardt, Wilhelm Vosskamp, and Stevens Garlick, three scholars who have devoted specific attention to the complexities of *Anton Reiser*'s formal structure. In building off of their observations, it will demonstrate how Moritz's decision to complicate *Reiser*'s narration undercuts the narrator's methodology of experiential psychology, thereby introducing doubt into the established reading contract and fostering a phenomenological awareness of the reading process in Moritz's readers. By placing his readers outside the fabric of narration instead of submerging them in it, Moritz achieves his goal "to direct man's attention more to man himself and to make his individual existence more significant."[11]

When read this way, *Anton Reiser* becomes more than a careful documentation of reading-addiction and its effects on the life of young Moritz—it is also Moritz's attempted vaccine. Moritz counteracts the spread of reading-addiction by

---

[10] Joachim Heinrich Campe, *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Bd. 3. (Braunschweig: s.n., 1809), 105. "Leselust: die Lust, oder große Neigung zu lesen, weil man Vergnügen daran findet."

[11] Karl Philipp Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, trans. John R. Russel (Columbia: Camden House, 1996), 1. Cf. Karl Philipp Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologischer Roman* (Verlag: Deutscher Taschenbuch, 1987), 7. „...die Aufmerksamkeit des Menschen mehr auf den Menschen selbst zu heften, und ihm sein individuelles Dasein wichtiger zu machen."

cultivating a critical consciousness of literary culture and its societal function in his readers. He encourages them to assume agency within literary culture instead of being passively shaped by it, and in so doing, he offers a new vision of selfhood capable of preserving the autonomy of the self while creating space for a shared bourgeois society.

Reiser, *Empfahrungsseelenkunde*, and the Psychology of *Lesesucht*

In *ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΥΤΟΝ, oder Magazin für Empfahrungsseelenkunde als ein Lesebuch für Gelehrte und Ungelehrte* (*KNOW THYSELF!, or the Magazine of Experiential Psychology as Reading for Scholar and Layman*, edited between 1783 and 1793), Moritz laid the foundation for what he called *Seelenkrankheitslehre*, or a theory of mental illness. The *Magazine*'s debut coincided with the height of Moritz's writing career—in one decade he published a number of aesthetic treatises, the novels *Anton Reiser* and *Andreas Hartknopf*, two popular travelogues, and of course, multiple psychological essays.[12] Through the *Magazine*, Moritz hoped to spearhead a branch of scientific research, *Empfahrungsseelenkunde*, which approached the human psyche introspectively. Through the observation of his or her own psychological responses to external stimuli, the practitioner of experiential psychology gleaned a more precise understanding of how he or she had been shaped by exceptional or traumatic events throughout his or her lifetime. Working together, the wider community of experiential psychologists could then

[12] Martin L. Davies, "The Theme of Communication in *Anton Reiser*: A Reflection on the Feasibility of the Enlightenment," *Oxford German Studies* 12, no. 1 (1981), 19.

pool their personal observations of human psychological processes and thereby establish a basic framework for what could be considered psychologically-sound selfhood.[13]

Like Kant, Moritz believed that the autonomy of the individual subject grounded moral activity on both the personal and societal level; the experiential psychology promoted in his *Magazine*, therefore, was a tangible step in rebuilding the public sphere, which he believed, due to "pedagogics not grounded in particular observations and experiences," had begun to lose its grasp of rational individuality, and hence its grasp on morality.[14] He posited a human nature defined by both mentality and emotion, and the relationship between the psychology of the mind and the autonomy of the will would become the Holy Grail of both the *Magazine* and, in his mind, all other edifying works of literature.[15] Moritz's focus on the pedagogical function of literature did not occur in a vacuum. By the end of the eighteenth century, the role of novels in the education of children and adolescents had steadily grown in prominence, due to the perceived ability of writing to make an

---

[13] Niethardt, "Narration and Consciousness in the Late Eighteenth-Century German Novel," 21-24.

[14] Karl Philipp Moritz, "Vorschlag zu einem Magazin zur Empfahrungsseelenkunde," in *Dichtungen und Schriften zur Erfahrungsseelenkunde*, ed. by Heide Hollmer and Albert Meier, Deutscher Klassiker Verlag im Taschenbuch 8 (Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 2006), 794-795. „Was ist unsere ganze Moral, wenn sie nicht von Individuis abstrahiert ist? Der Grundriß eines Gebäudes im Sande, den ein kleines Lüftchen zerstört, ein ohngefährer Umriß ohne innern Gehalt, eben so wie alle Pädagogik, sie sich nicht auf spezielle Beobachtungen und Erfahrungen gründet" (translation mine).

[15] Wilhelm Vosskamp, "*Poetik der Beobachtung. Karl Philipp Moritz'* Anton Reiser *zwischen Autobiographie und Bildungsroman*," *Études Germaniques* July-Sept, no. 51 (1996), 474.

impression on young imaginations and to give concrete examples of how to live one's life.[16] But an increase in the importance of edifying fiction came with a renewed focus on defining what, exactly, was edifying—as Moritz believed that popular literature and the German school system failed to foster the rational self-understanding integral to the *Bildungsprozess*, he introduced experiential psychology and novels inspired by it as a supplement (or perhaps even a cure) for the institutions in place.

But why did Moritz find the popular novels of his day insufficient? The answer lies in an exploration of the difference between the *Bildungsprozess* and the theory of selfhood espoused by Sentimental novels. The concept of *Bildung* drew on an earlier rationalist theory of selfhood, the *tabula rasa* theory of John Locke, which posited a self that "came into being as it took in sensations from the outside world and, of that material, composed first the ideas and then the judgment and moral sense that gave it a self-enclosed and internally coherent identity."[17] The self undergoing *Bildung* related to the outside world sympathetically—because reason arbitrated between life experiences and emotional impulses, (at least theoretically) external stimuli could be internalized without jeopardizing the "self-enclosure" of the individual's subjectivity, without which the self could not be considered autonomous.

Sentimental theorists, however, doubted that an individual reliant upon external stimuli could truly remain separate and closed-off from the external world that supplied them—for, "if, by the same token, the knowledge one acquires…comes from outside then who is to say that the subject

---

[16] Wrage, "Jene Fabrik der Bücher. Über Lesesucht, ein Phantasma des medialen Ursprungs und die Kinder- und Jugendliteratur der Aufklärung," 5-7.

[17] Nancy Armstrong, *How Novels Think: The Limits of Individualism from 1719-1900* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 1.

is not permeable to sensations already packaged as ideas, invested with value, and charged with feeling? Who is to say that either our ideas or feelings are in fact our own?"[18] Thus the Sentimental movement developed its own philosophical anthropology influenced by moral sense philosophy and the neurophysiology of Albrecht von Haller,[19] and it rejected moral systems prioritizing reason over emotion, arguing that the alienation of the human individual from his or her emotions, often identified as animalistic impulses, would inevitably divorce human nature the very *nature* that sustains it. *Empfindsamkeit* adopted a theory of nervous sympathy that attributed emotional experiences to the interplay of liquid-esque "vital spirits" travelling back and forth from the outside world and the brain in hollowed-out tubes, the nerves.[20] Just as streams of liquid converge, diverge, swell, and overflow their containers, emotions spread and grew as individuals made contact with nature and each other. Therefore, in contrast to the rational separation of the self and other created through the *Bildungsprozess*, Sentimentality sacrificed the uniqueness and autonomy of the self in favor of an easier channel between its interior and exterior, a move which would hopefully resolve the greatest problem of the *Bildung* model—so long as the self remained self-enclosed and distinct from its immediate surroundings, how could individuals ever bridge the gap of their subjective experiences and create a shared experience upon which to build civil society? Sentimental neurophilosophy offered a system in which the individual would no longer be forced into isolation behind the wall of his or her own mind, thereby allowing for the creation of community—but it did so

---

[18] Armstrong, 10.

[19] Catherine J. Minter, "Literary *Empfindsamkeit* and Nervous Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Germany," *Modern Language Review* 96, no. 4 (2001): 1016-1017.

[20] Minter, "Literary *Empfindsamkeit* and Nervous Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Germany," 1050.

at a price. Behind "nervous sympathy" lay the danger of absolute *empathy*: the self existed in constant and immediate contact with its surrounding environment, and, by virtue of the self's constant exposure, the relationship between interiority and exteriority could only be described as "assimilation"[21] or, more menacingly, as "contagion."[22]

Moritz feared that the absolute empathy modeled by characters in popular Sentimental novels would be replicated to such a degree in their readers that young audiences would lose the ability to distinguish between reality and fiction. Sentimentality thus became the pathogen of reading-addiction—the experience of reading Sentimental literature favored imagination over reason, and when taken to extremes, this imagination would so exaggerate the discrepancies between the titillating fantasies of Sentimentality and the harsh reality of eighteenth-century Prussian autocracy that the reading-addict increasingly escaped into novel reading instead of facing everyday life. The pull of fantasy transformed his or her behavior, and when reality failed to supply the pristine, empowering, and exciting vision promised by the latest novel—when the surge of affectation and emotional stimulation ran dry—the patient dwindled into a state of melancholy and enervation.

And so, Moritz's exploration of his personal relationship with reading-addiction, his observations of the relationship between reading-addiction and Sentimentality, and his desire to reform the literary-pedagogical system using the principles of experiential psychology coincided in the creation

---

[21] Minter, 1022. "In *Allwill*, Sylli describes the act of 'sympathizing' with something in the external world, here a flower, as a process of physical *assimilation* of the other into the self..." (emphasis mine).

[22] Armstrong, 20. "...what was to stop feelings from flowing in the opposite direction from spectacle to spectator, making us the ones to be infused with another's feelings? In this event, the radically individualistic logic of sympathy would capitulate to the antagonistic logic of *contagion*" (emphasis mine). Cf. Minter, 1021.

of his semi-autobiographical novel *Anton Reiser*, published anonymously (though with Moritz listed as editor) in four parts over five years. Each installment included a preface, written by Moritz, introducing the current book and guiding the reader's reception of it. Though subtitled "a psychological novel," Moritz instructs his readers that it "could just as well be called a biography because for the greatest part the observations are taken from real life,"[23] and unlike other novels which "dispersed the power of the imagination" across a number of characters and locations, *Anton Reiser* would "concentrate it and focus the view of the soul into itself," in order "to direct man's attention more to man himself and to make his individual existence more significant."[24] The psycho-biographical nature of the novel is further reinforced by the presence of an unnamed heterodiegetic narrator (a narrator external to the plot) who functions as a model experiential psychologist, observing the impact of childhood and adolescent occurrences on the psychological development of Anton Reiser, the titular character. Sections of the text have been italicized, resembling a lab report with underlined facts and findings, and occasionally Moritz inserts selections of Reiser's poetry as if sampling the work of a psychiatric patient. Taken together, *Anton Reiser* resembles less a novel and more a case

---

[23] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 1. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologischer Roman*, 7. "Dieser psychologische Roman könnte allenfalls eine Biographie genannt werden, weil die Beobachtungen größenteils aus dem wirklichen Leben genommen wird."

[24] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 1. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologischer Roman*, 7. "Auch wird man in einem Buche, welches vorzüglich die innere Geschichte erwarten: denn es soll die vorstellende Kraft nicht verteilen sondern sie zusammendrängen, und den Blick der Seele in sich selber schärfen....wenigstens wird doch vorzüglich in pädogogischer Rücksicht, das Bestreben nie ganz unnütz sein, die Aufmerksamkeit des Menschen mehr auf den Menschen selbst zu heften, und ihm sein individuelles Dasein wichtiger zu machen."

study. Proceeding largely chronologically, the novel traces Reiser's life from birth through his developmental years and his adolescent education. It chronicles his intense need for affirmation, his only somewhat successful literary career, his dogged pursuit of the theatre, his growing shame of poverty, and, of course, his melancholia and unshakeable reading-addiction.

Moritz allows *Anton Reiser*'s candid display of experiential psychology to function as a field guide for laymen and future psychologists alike. The prefaces situate the reader alongside the narrator, allowing him or her to examine the narrator's methodology and incorporate it into the reading experience. Identifying the traumas in Reiser's psychological history and connecting them to the effects on his psyche prepares the reader to apply this practice reflexively and, in so doing, to reveal any latent psychological deviations in his or her own life that might have hampered healthy self-development and which otherwise manifest themselves in illness like reading-addiction. And thus, under experiential psychology, the *Bildungsprozess* becomes inextricably linked to autobiographical self-narration. Moritz considers autobiography an invaluable tool for comprehending oneself teleologically and treats past selves as meaningful iterations on the way to the autonomous, free individuality that, if not realized presently, could certainly be achieved in the future. Experiential psychology's introspective analysis transformed history into a narrative by which the self related back to itself, empowering the subject to make sense of the life experiences that, per the *Bildungsprozess*, guided its journey from innate potentiality to personal and social actuality.

Moritz conjectured that neglecting to analyze oneself autobiographically would result in a murky, ambiguous, ambivalent, and deeply problematic relationship to the chains of causality that bridge one's past and present personalities. Because such a student would remain unaware of the role of traumatic events and external stimuli in his or her mental development, he or she would be unable to realize the power of the

will's autonomy to overcome psychological determinism. The past would not appear as a series of choices, steps toward or away from the path of healthy mental development, but would instead seem to be something that merely happened. This problem plagues Reiser for the entirety of the novel, and it is no coincidence that the same man whose *Magazine* called out from its cover "Know thyself!" writes a character whose fatal flaw is self-ignorance. Anton Reiser has no self-awareness or, at best, a deeply flawed one. Consider the following excerpt from the third book of *Anton Reiser*:

> But just as a person always searches for the most compelling reasons for doing what he wants to do as if to justify his conduct to himself, so Reiser tried to regard paying the small debts he had been led to incur as an impossible matter and revealing the same as so embarrassing that solely on account of this he believed he had to leave Hannover. But his actual motivations were the irresistible urge to change his situation and the desire to perform publicly in some way as soon as possible in order to gain fame and approval. To him nothing could seem better suited for this than the stage where it isn't even regarded as vanity when a person wants to display himself in public to his advantage as often as possible, but where, on the contrary, an addiction to applause is, so to speak, privileged.[25]

Here, instead of acknowledging his desire to escape triviality and to accrue the accolades demanded by his vanity, Reiser deceives himself, spinning some story of a young man overcome by insurmountable debt with no further recourse but to remove himself from the presence of his creditors. Crucially, this leads to a decision which is neither autonomous nor moral:

---

[25] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 204. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologische Roman*, 274-275.

Reiser now "must" leave Hannover, believing that he has fallen into a situation over which he has no control, even though doing so amounts to cheating his lenders and benefactors. Had Reiser seriously questioned this storyline and made better use of rational thinking, he might have been able to find a small job, budget more effectively, and set himself up to pay off his debts before seriously pursuing theatre in a way that required neither secrecy nor deception. In fact, had he further observed that his dramatic inclinations were not a calling but psychological responses to the patterns of self-negation he had continuously fostered since childhood, he might have avoided acting in the first place, the pursuit of which, by the end of the novel, leaves him stranded in a distant town.

Reiser's autobiographical task has derailed, revealing the dangers of self-narration when it goes unconsciously and unquestioned—melancholy and reading-addiction are but two possible maladies that arise when the rational narrative impulse is hijacked by imagination. One's self-conception ripples and distorts in the circus-mirror of fantasy and self-aggrandizement, leading to the cognitive dissonance and chronic escapism characteristic of reading-addiction, and prolonged exposure to this state rends the self's coherency. As Moritz writes of Reiser:

> This produced a never-ending war within him. He did not think frivolously enough to follow every suggestion from his imagination and thereby be satisfied with himself. On the other hand, he wasn't strong enough to pursue steadfastly a realistic plan that was in conflict with his fanciful imagination....Within him, as within thousands of souls, there battled Truth and Illusion, Dream and Reality, and it remained undecided which of these two would come out on top.[26]

---

[26] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 215. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologische Roman*, 289-290. Special atten-

Reiser self-narrates subconsciously—even unconsciously—and the resulting autobiography is perverted by an imbalance of reason and imagination. Because Reiser, unlike a good experiential psychologist, neglects to rationally interrogate and refine his storyline as he narrates it, he falls into a state of powerlessness and insignificance and begins to suspect that his free, autonomous individuality is in fact fictional. Thus the prefaces and the narrator suggest that Reiser's only hope for overcoming reading-addiction is to regain the internal coherency of the self through self-reflection in which reason, not imagination or emotion, is the governing faculty. Only by returning to the enclosure of sympathy could the melancholic patient rationalize how and why he responded to specific environmental conditions, knowledge that would restore power and autonomy to his will previously paralyzed by inclination.

Moritz presents experiential psychology as giving power to the powerless and significance to those burdened by insignificance. His portrayal of reading-addiction in *Anton Reiser* highlights a rationalist, *Bildung*-oriented view of self-development and indicates why proponents of the *Bildungsprozess* opposed the production and popularity of sentimental novels: mass consumption of Sentimental novels threatened to erode the modern ideal of subjectivity upon which the social, moral progress of the Enlightenment was

---

tion might paid to subtleties in the original German which are easily lost in translation, such as the description of Reiser's imagination as being *schwärmerisch* and the contrast between *Wahrheit* and *Blendwerk*. The latter word, meaning "illusion," relates etymologically to *Blende*, which refers to a screen, covering, or aperture—Moritz is contrasting that which is directly observable in real life ("Beobachtung größenteils aus dem wirklichen Leben," p.7) and that which has been filtered through the literature and imaginative fantasy.

predicated and of which the bourgeoisie was supposedly constituted. As a fictive biography modeled after the principles of experiential psychology, *Anton Reiser* serves as a template for the kinds of literature Moritz hoped would right a careening literary culture.

The Failure of Autobiuography and the Role of the Psychological Novel

Despite its initial presentation, *Anton Reiser* is not simply a fictive biography, and the solution to reading-addiction is not as simple as telling oneself the right kind of story. Because Anton Reiser's story corresponds so closely to Moritz's personal history, and because the narrator often comments with such specificity on the internal workings of Reiser's mind—something he could not have known unless he had a deeply personal connection to Reiser from birth—there is good reason to suspect that the central character of Moritz's "biography" is either heavily based on Moritz's or is none other than Moritz himself.[27] This hypothesis is further supported by *Anton Reiser*'s formal similarity to Pietistic journaling and letter-writing—Moritz's employs Pietism's characteristic practice, with its mystical focus on interior life, even as he describes a character whose upbringing revolves around the writings of a French mystic concerned with the "Inner Word."[28]

---

[27] Stevens Garlick, "Moritz's *Anton Reiser*: The Dissonant Voice of Psycho-Autobiography," *Studi germanici* 21 (1997), 42-43.

[28] Cf. Wilhelm Vosskamp, "Poetik der Beobachtung. Karl Philipp Moritz' *Anton Reiser* zwischen Autobiographie und Bildungsroman," *Études Germaniques* July-Sept, no. 51 (1996), 475; Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 2; Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologische Roman*, 9; Barbara Becker-Cantarino, "Introduction: German Literature in the Era of Enlightenment and Sensibil-

Therefore, *Anton Reiser* might best be understood as *auto*biography, fictionalized and transposed into the third-person. But though the notion that a novel training its readers in *Empfahrungsseelenkunde* self-analysis would make heavy use of autobiography is unsurprising, the admission of autobiography into the formal characteristics of *Anton Reiser* raises a number of interpretative questions: (1) Is *Anton Reiser* a novel, biography, or autobiography? (2) Why use third-person instead of first-person? (3) If Anton Reiser is really to be understood as Moritz, and the narrator (by virtue of his deep knowledge of Reiser's inner-life and his explicit use of experiential psychology) is also to be understood as Moritz, and if Moritz names himself as editor on the novel's cover, why three Moritzes instead of one?

A number of have scholars have introduced possible explanations for *Reiser*'s internal structure. Vosskamp, for example, claims that Moritz differentiates his perspective between character and narrator so that both perspectives may then be consummated in the perspective of the reader—just as the novel pits Reiser's *schwärmerische*[29] imagination against

---

ity," in *German Literature of the Eighteenth Century: The Enlightenment and Sensibility*, ed. Barbara Becker-Cantarino (Rochester: Camden House, 2005), 14.

[29] For more information regarding the term *Schwärmerei*—which connotes a "swarming frenzy" but whose long and complicated history leaves translations such as "excessive enthusiasm or sentiment" unsatisfactory—one might consult the anthology *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850*, edited by Lawrence E. Klein and Anthony J. La Vopa—especially Anthony La Vopa, "The Philosopher and the *Schwärmer*: On the Career of a German Epithet from Luther to Kant," *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850* (Huntington Library: San Marino, 1998), 85-116. Describing the efforts of philosopher Christian Garve, he writes: "Garve posited an 'essential difference' between *Schwärmerei*—as self-delusion, the mistaking of 'fictions' for 'real knowledge'—and *Enthusiasmus* (the creative inspiration that 'exalts desires, raises hopes, and beautifies what is really there') He

the realities of his everyday existence, Moritz pits Reiser against the narrator, allowing the reader to be a "third-order" party of observation.[30] Garlick, recognizing that "[Moritz's] is, accordingly, a pedagogically inspired intersubjective enterprise," sees the use of the third-person in autobiography as a way of inviting the reader to identify with Reiser and ensuring the novel, otherwise full of "unmitigated misery" and "maudlin recollections," actually sells.[31] But throughout his essay, Garlick also highlights the relationship between Moritz's transformation of his autobiography into a third-person work of fiction and autobiography-theorist Louis Renza's theory of "presentification." Renza considers autobiography a unique phenomenon, separate from both fiction and non-fiction, shaped by the act of presentification, an attempt to bring the unreachable past into the present moment.[32] In order to presentify, the author must separate his or her present self from the past iterations under scrutiny, a "split personality" that subtly pressures the linguistic structure of the text by destabilizing

---

broke down *Schwärmerei* into the 'speculative' and the 'practical' (including the 'fanatical'); into separatists and the 'persecuting orthodox'; into politically agitating '*Religion-Schwärmer*' and the 'political *Schwärmer*' of the French Revolution" (86). He also discusses Martin Luther's use of the term, originally popularized as referring to the "mistaken conviction that one had become a receptacle of divine inspiration or an immediate revelation" (88) and Herder's belief that such "fanaticism" could apply equally to rationalist philosophers as to sentimentalists (91-92). *Schwärmerei* later came to be associated with radical German nationalism (see: Williamson, "What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789-1818," 920).

[30] Vosskamp, "Poetik der Beobachtung. Karl Philipp Moritz' *Anton Reiser* zwischen Autobiographie und Bildungsroman," 474; 477.

[31] Garlick, "Moritz's *Anton Reiser*: The Dissonant Voice of Psycho-Autobiography," 44.

[32] Louis A. Renza, "The Veto of Imagination: A Theory of Autobiography," *New Literary History* 9, no. 1 (1977), 3-5.

its main referential marker, the first-person pronoun. The author's split personality becomes an unspoken "split intentionality,"[33] which Renza summarizes in the following segment of his article:

> To acknowledge such a pressure and yet to persist in the autobiographical project, the autobiographer must come to terms with a unique pronominal crux: how can he keep using the first-person pronoun, his sense of self-reference, without its becoming—since it becomes, in the course of writing, something other than strictly his own self-referential sign—a de facto third-person pronoun?[34]

Here Renza invokes the distinction between *enunciation*, or the discursive message intended, and *utterance*, the form of message, or the particular arrangement of linguistic elements that carry it. He observes that in autobiography, despite consistent usage of *I* throughout the plane of utterance, the gulf between the past and present self widens in the plane of enunciation as the narrative progresses—what is signified increasingly diverges from its signifier. As a result, both past and present identities become fictionalized. The past self, lost to the present, narrows from the fullness of human being in all its complexity into a character circumscribed by the present self's understanding and intentions; meanwhile the present, now beholden to a constrained image of its own history, grows increasingly frustrated, fictionalizing itself in order to correspond more closely to the past. As soon as the autobiography

---

[33] Renza, "The Veto of Imagination: A Theory of Autobiography," 9-10. "Autobiographical writing thus entails split intentionality: the 'I' becoming a 'he'; the writer's awareness of his life becoming private even as he brings it into the public domain or presentifies it through his act of writing."

[34] Renza, 9.

engages with the past, nonfiction becomes impossible, and according to Renza, all autobiographers must attempt to circumvent this essential dilemma. They must accept the impossibility of authentically conveying the past to the present and instead preserve something of the present for the future.[35]

The impossibility of true presentification undermines Moritz's autobiographical *Bildungsprozess*. His attempt to analyze, using observations taken strictly from "real life,"[36] the progression of his psyche from past to present self inevitably creates wholly new figures all throughout the timeline. Since, in hindsight, these past iterations became conscribed by Moritz's "surplus of seeing," they retained more qualities of otherness than Moritz-ness, and therefore they could never serve as building-blocks for a self-enclosed subjectivity.[37] As constructs, they are robbed of their autonomy; their identity is defined by the imposition of the present Moritz upon them. Thus, ironically, because of presentification the autobiographical *Bildungsprozess* comes dangerously close to defining the self as an internalized community of personalities undergoing Sentimental assimilation and contagion. And while Moritz envisioned autobiographical introspection as a tool for reaching

---

[35] Renza, 3-4.

[36] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 1. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologische Roman*, 7.

[37] This terminology can be traced to Bakhtin architectonics, a theory Cusack expertly applies to *Anton Reiser* in Andrew Cusack, "The Biographical Imagination in Moritz's *Anton Reiser*," *Orbis Litterarum* 70, no. 3 (2015), 253-259. Here a "surplus of seeing" refers ones ability to see in another what he or she cannot due to "blind spots" —"the world behind [one's] back" (qtd. in 253)—in his or her subjective perspective. To aesthetically engage with another person would require one to first enter into the other's perspective empathetically and then fill in its blind spots using one's own surplus of seeing (254). Thus in fiction, the character is "consummated" (254) in the author's and reader's full vision of him, a fact that establishes writing and reading as aesthetic acts.

a stable and comprehensive understanding of his present psychological makeup, he neglected to account for the fact that the self at the instance of achieving self-understanding transforms into a new person. The hand that draws the arrow moves the target, and the self remains as blind to its present self as before.

Because the self of teleological self-narration can be considered neither factual nor stable, autobiography can only ever be considered a failed exercise in personal *Bildung*. The problem of presentification forces Moritz to answer whether an individual can actually achieve autonomy when he or she may or may not be qualified to be his or her own authority. Niethardt, for this reason, devotes a third of *Narration and Consciousness in the Late 18 Century German Novel* to refuting the reliability of *Reiser*'s narrator, claiming that the manner in which the narrator narrates (the *discours*) is compromised by the nature of what he is narrating (the *histoire*). She believes that the novel fails to achieve its goals because of the impossibility of achieving "objective-subjectivity" presupposed by experiential psychology, which paradoxically asks its practitioners to objectively study their always-subjective personal history.[38]

If Moritz intends to create a suitable alternative to Sentimental literature, capable of critiquing and reforming literary culture from the inside out, he must first posit a new theory of self-development somehow independent of the introspective *Bildungsprozess* and must transform his first-person autobiography into a different, more complexly-structured narrative. Both Garlick and Vosskamp demonstrate that *Anton Reiser*'s genre-bending and use of the third-person are intrinsically connected. Their analyses follow on earlier work by Philipp Lejeune, who theorizes that shifting autobiographical narration from the first- to third-person may profitably engage

[38] Niethardt, 62-65.

the problem of Renza's split-intentionality by displacing it.[39] Lejeune demonstrates that "transposing" the first-person text into third-person opens up autobiography to shift fluidly between other related genres.[40] The presence of the *he*, in contrast with the spoken or un-spoken *I*, becomes a "figure of enunciation," or a figurative-language construct representing in the utterance the gap between the author's past and present identities in the enunciation.[41] Because this model acknowledges the *I*'s fundamental dissonance, it affords the author some degree of control over it. By privileging instances of the *I* in some cases and the *he* in others, the autobiographer shifts the reader's focus between two varying, temporally-situated perspectives, a process dubbed "applying the soft pedal."[42] Lejeune's theory offers solutions to many of the formal questions raised by the quandary of *Anton Reiser*'s autobiographicality—in *Anton Reiser*, biography and the psychological novel are transpositions of Moritz's autobiography mediated between three points in time: (1) Anton Reiser, or Moritz within his own history, (2) the narrator, or Moritz within the

---

[39] Philipp Lejeune, "Autobiography in the Third Person," trans. Annette Tomarken and Edward Tomarken, *New Literary History* 9, no. 1 (1977), 40. "The problem of identity cannot be avoided, but it can be faced squarely by being displaced."

[40] Lejeune, "Autobiography in the Third Person," 39-40; 33. "Each transformation thus inscribes itself into the framework of *the figured movement from one genre to another*. This movement takes place all the more easily because the initial genre (autobiography) and the later genres (biography, novel) have many common characteristics and, throughout their history, have always developed by a series of reciprocal grafts and exchanges."

[41] Lejeune, 34.

[42] Lejeune, 29. "At the very moment of writing, I mold my sentences by means of a sort of scouring away and transposition of personal discourse. I write myself by silencing myself or, more precisely, by putting the soft pedal on myself. I would only have to raise my foot to increase the volume."

autobiographical act of remembering and writing, and (3) editorial Moritz, the speaker of the prefaces, situated beyond the autobiographical act and thus reflecting equally on his life and his life story.

Moritz uses *Anton Reiser*'s complicated diegetic structure as a mechanism separating himself from the autobiographical act and controlling his authorial intrusion on the novel's narration. Primarily, this allows him to interrupt an otherwise quiet reading experience with tremors of uncertainty, revoking the reader's suspension of disbelief and provoking him or her to take a closer look at the character of the narrator. Targeted instances of irony undercut the narrator's reliability and raise a meta-awareness of the reading process in Moritz's readers—which is to say, when Niethardt observes a breakdown between *histoire* and *discours* in which Moritz's narrator fails to live up to the ideal of experiential psychology, she reveals less a flaw in the system and more an intent behind the system itself. This technique is especially prevalent in *Anton Reiser*'s third installment, when Reiser's poetry comes under the direct scrutiny of both narrator and reader. Consider the narrator's evaluation of Reiser's poem "The Wise Man's Soul":

> He also again turned his hand to poetry which, however, always concerned general concepts and again inclined to speculation, which was always his favorite occupation.... Thus he was once walking in the meadow where the tall, scattered trees stood and his ideas gradually ascended to the concept of the infinite.[43]

The narrator quickly dismisses "The Wise Man's Soul" as the stuff of mere "speculation," too abstract to qualify as art. But the reader cannot move on so easily. Reiser's use of poetry is,

---

[43] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 164-5. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologische Roman*, 224.

in its own way, a form of self-narration; he chooses poetry and drama as ways of articulating his daily struggles and observations. If Moritz had intended his readers to receive Reiser's perspective as nothing more than the empty speculation of a troubled mind, he could have simply omitted "The Wise Man's Soul," or included it as a footnote in the margins of an otherwise-larger story. But instead, dialing back the soft pedal, he consciously places Reiser's narration alongside that of the narrator. Accessing not only the narrator's comments but also to the full text of the poem unsettles the reader; he or she feels Moritz's cue to evaluate both the poem and the narrator's opinion of it, a demand which threatens to reverse the hierarchy of authority between reader and narrator and dissolve the stabilizing reading contract established by Moritz in the prefaces.[44] For perhaps the first time, the reader feels the presence of a third perspective, the editorial Moritz, beyond both character and narrator. The reader begins to suspect that he or she has entered into a false contract, is speaking a different "code," and has placed his or her trust in a narrator as misguided and unreliable as Reiser himself.[45]

In absence of a named author, the highest remaining authority, the suspicious reader is left to decide whether to

---

[44] In Philipp Lejeune, "The Autobiographical Pact," in *On Autobiography*, trans. Katherine Leary (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988), Lejeune describes the "reading contract" as a shared "code" (29) between reader and author that, once established, governs the reader's relationship with the text. Reading contracts are part literary and part sociological—a reading contract affirms in text the generic expectations the reader brings to it according to writing and publishing conventions. The difference, then, between autobiography, biography, and fiction is not so much a matter of formal characteristics but of reading contracts, which affirm or deny certain "identities" (such as author-narrator or narrator-character) and which inform the reader's understanding of how characters in the text are meant to resemble "models" in reality.

[45] Cf. Lejeune, "The Autobiographical Pact," 29.

continue in the footsteps of an unreliable narrator and risk ending up stranded (like Reiser) in uncertainty or to assume authorship of the story's meaning his or herself. This ironic reversal of the author-reader relationship serves a vital role in achieving Moritz's stated aim for the novel: "to direct man's attention more to man himself and to make his individual existence more significant."[46] The startled reader awakens from a dreamlike emersion in Moritz's narrative and becomes conscious of his or her reading relationship with the text, a renewable container of discourse in which the reader is not only a very real participant but also the primary one.[47] By undercutting his reliability over his own life story, Moritz gives his readers a voice, and in so doing, he transforms his failed attempt at a psycho-autobiographical *Bildungsprozess* into a phenomenological experience that reinforces the autonomy of both author and reader. If thus unable to create a stable sense of his present selfhood through a teleological evaluation of his past, Moritz can still afford his past iterations value and meaning not by attempting to presentify some full, nuanced, complicated, and now unreachably-distant human being but by accepting memory's fictive nature and relating to it as a literary construct. Through the publication of *Anton Reiser*, Moritz invited readers to invest in his own troubled history, to reflect on their own past, to look deep into the workings of the human psyche, and to accept, even celebrate, its blind spots. He affirms an intrinsically-literary self but rejects that the self is a

---

[46] Moritz, *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*, 1. Cf. Moritz, *Anton Reiser: ein psychologischer Roman*, 7.

[47] V. E. Obima, "Literary Transactions and the Phenomenology of Language," *Ekpoma Journal of Languages and Literary Studies: EJOLLS* 5 (1992), 106-107. "...As the French poet, Paul Valery has indicated, ordinary discourse vanishes or dissolves as soon as it has communicated an idea and brought understanding but literature is preserved and interpreted again as if its usefulness can never be exhausted."

product of literature—the self does *not* gain autonomy and significance through self-narration, it *is* autonomous, is *utterly* significant, *because it can narrate to itself.*

This new conception of selfhood represents a radical departure from other rationalist notions of the self at the end of the eighteenth-century, which viewed it as a product to be built and not a freedom to be assumed. Anticipating the work of existential phenomenologists nearly a century after its publication, *Anton Reiser* reawakens its readers to a consciousness of their existence as autonomous beings within literary culture, not patients of some Sentimental assimilation or contagion from it. It demonstrates that a civil society of free, autonomous individuals can be achieved—if not in spite of literary culture, then through it—when individuals create meaning in-and-for-themselves from a shared set of aesthetic objects and, more broadly, the shared conditions of bourgeois existence: self-consciousness enables solidarity. Literary culture is then redeemed and reading-addiction prevented when readers no longer attempt to derive their selfhood and value from novels but rather reorient themselves as agents in the reading process. In a way, Moritz's solution to reading-addiction replaces reading addiction with a writing one—in *Anton Reiser*, he reminds his audience that freedom comes when chronic readers take up authorship of their own subjective identity. Only then, with both feet planted firmly in the world of reality, may they begin to venture into the world of books, and even venture boldly.

Works Cited

Armstrong, Nancy. *How Novels Think: The Limits of Individualism from 1719-1900*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.

Becker-Cantarino, Barbara. "Introduction: German Literature in the Era of Enlightenment and Sensibility." In *German Literature of the Eighteenth Century: The Enlightenment and Sensibility*, edited by Barbara Becker-Cantarino, 1-31. Rochester: Camden House, 2005.

Campe, Joachim Heinrich. *Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. Braunschweig: 1809.

Cusack, Andrew. "The Biographical Imagination in Moritz's *Anton Reiser*." *Orbis Litterarum* 70, no. 3 (2015): 234-262.

Davies, Martin L. "The Theme of Communication in *Anton Reiser*: A Reflection on the Feasibility of the Enlightenment." *Oxford German Studies* 12, no. 1 (1981): 18-38.

Garlick, Stevens. "Moritz's *Anton Reiser*: The Dissonant Voice of Psycho-Autobiography." *Studi germanici* 21 (1983): 41-60.

Heinzmann, Johann Georg. *Appel an meine Nation über Aufklärung und Aufklärer; über Gelehrsamkeit und Schriftsteller; über Büchermanufakturisten, Rezensenten, Buchhändler; über moderne Philosophen und Menschenerzieher; auch über mancherley anderes, was Menschenfreyheit und Menschenrechte betrifft*. Bern: 1795.

Joeres, Ruth-Ellen Boetcher. "The German Enlightenment (1720-1790)." In *The Cambridge History of German Literature*, edited by Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly, 147-201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Kant, Immanuel. *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated by Lewis White Beck. In *Philosophical Writings*, edited by Ernst Behler, 55-125. New York: Continuum Publishing Company, 1999.

La Vopa, Anthony J. "The Philosopher and the *Schwärmer*: On the Career of a German Epithet from Luther to Kant." In *Enthusiasm and Enlightenment in Europe, 1650-1850*, edited by Lawrence E. Klein and Anthony J. La Vopa, 85-116. San Marino: Huntington Library, 1998.

Lejeune, Philipp. "Autobiography in the Third Person." Translated by Annette Tomarken and Edward Tomarken. *New Literary History* 9, no. 1 (1977): 27-50.

Lejeune, Philipp. "The Autobiographical Pact." In *On Autobiography*. Translated by Katherine Leary. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Lemke, Anja. "Bildung als *formatio vitae*—Zum Verhältnis von Leben und Form in Judith Schalanskys *Der Hals der Giraffe*." *Internationales Archiv für Sozialgeschichte der deutschen Literatur* 41, no. 2 (2016): 395-411.

Minter, Catherine J. "Literary *Empfindsamkeit* and Nervous Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Germany." *Modern Language Review* 96, no. 4 (2001): 1016-28.

Moritz, Karl Philipp. *Anton Reiser: ein psychologischer Roman*. Verlag: Deutscher Taschenbuch, 1987.

Moritz, Karl Philipp. *Anton Reiser: A Psychological Novel*. Translated by John R. Russel. Columbia: Camden House, 1996.

Moritz, Karl Philipp. "*Vorschlag zu einem Magazin zur Empfahrungsseelenkunde*." In *Dichtungen und Schriften zur Erfahrungsseelenkunde*, edited by Heide Hollmer and Albert Meier. Frankfurt am Main: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag, 2006.

Niethardt, Sandra Maike Christine. "Narration and Consciousness in the Late Eighteenth-Century German Novel." PhD diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2016. ProQuest (10245758).

Obinna, V. E. "Literary Transactions and the Phenomenology of Language." *Ekpoma Journal of Languages and Literary Studies: EJOLLS* 5 (1992): 102-113.

Renza, Louis A. "The Veto of Imagination: A Theory of Autobiography." *New Literary History* 9, no. 1 (1977): 1-26.

Sammons, Jeffery. "The Mystery of the Missing *Bildungsroman*, or: What Happened to *Wilhelm Meister*'s Legacy?" *Genre* 14, no. 2 (1981): 229-246.

Vosskamp, Wilhelm. "*Poetik der Beobachtung. Karl Philipp Moritz'* Anton Reiser *zwischen Autobiographie und Bildungsroman*." *Études Germaniques* July-Sept, no. 51 (1996): 471-480.

Williamson, George S. "What Killed August von Kotzebue? The Temptations of Virtue and the Political Theology of German Nationalism, 1789-1818." *The Journal of Modern History* 72, no. 4 (2000): 890-943.

Wrage, Henning. "*Jene Fabrik der Bücher. Über Lesesucht, ein Phantasma des medialen Ursprungs und die Kinder- und Jugendliteratur der Aufklärung.*" *Monatschaft* 102, no. 1 (2010): 1-21.

THE CONSCIENCE OF THE COLD WAR:
GENDER, FEAR, AND CONSEQUENCE IN MARGARET CHASE SMITH'S "DECLARATION OF CONSCIENCE"

Elizabeth Campbell

Taking a Stand

On June 1, 1950, freshman Senator Margaret Chase Smith, a moderate Republican from Maine, stood waiting on a DC Metro platform. The train that would take her to the Capitol was due any minute, and she was anxious about the day ahead. Her colleague, Senator Joseph McCarthy, the Republican senator from Wisconsin, greeted her on the platform. McCarthy noticed Smith's uneasy demeanor and addressed her: "Margaret, you look very serious. Are you going to make a speech?" "Yes, and you will not like it," she replied. McCarthy retorted, "Is it about me?" "Yes, but I'm not going to mention your name," Smith responded.[1] Just a short time later, with McCarthy sitting a mere few rows behind her, Margaret Chase Smith stood on the Senate floor to decry McCarthy's Red Scare hysteria in her hallmark speech, aptly titled "A Declaration of Conscience."

By February 1950, many Americans had expressed anxiety regarding Communist infiltration in the government because they feared the Soviet Union's growing influence in the Cold War. Senator McCarthy gave a speech on February 9, 1950, condemning suspected communist loyalists and

---

[1] Margaret Chase Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, ed. William C. Lewis, Jr. (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972), 12.

spies in the United States government.[2] McCarthy was granted seemingly unlimited power by the American people and the Senate itself to prosecute suspected communists at any cost, and by June, he was at his peak. Even those who sought to curtail his tactics, such as powerful Senator Millard Tydings of Maryland, could not deter McCarthy from his mission. Nevertheless, Margaret Chase Smith took McCarthy, a member of her own party, to task for the tyranny of his rhetoric. She used the "Declaration of Conscience" to implore her fellow Senators to "do some real soul searching and to weigh [their] consciences" at a time when policy was legislated on fear instead of fact.[3]

When Margaret Chase Smith rose to address the chamber that June day, she faced a formidable opponent in Joseph McCarthy. Her speech, which was one of the first to denounce McCarthy's tactics, was well-received at the time, and many news organizations and fellow senators praised Smith's grit and forceful appeal to respect the ideals of free speech and organization unrestricted by slander. Yet, for four years until his censure in 1954, McCarthy would continue his brazen pursuit of suspected communists mostly undeterred by outside forces. The "Declaration of Conscience," while lauded for its strong rhetoric and sensibility, ultimately failed to stop or constrain McCarthy's machinations, and Smith, though praised for her tenacity, was unable to garner the support necessary for meaningful resistance. In spite of Margaret Chase Smith's efforts, McCarthy was able to continue his campaign of suspicion and panic in the midst of the Cold War. Ultimately, national fear, sustained by the United States' involvement in conflicts abroad and within the government, as well as gender norms, bolstered by the broader

---

[2] Joseph McCarthy, "Speech at Wheeling, West Virginia," in Ellen Schrecker, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents*, (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002), 240.
[3] Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 13.

antifeminist movement of the time, proved to work against Margaret Chase Smith and her message.

The Meteoric Rise of Joseph McCarthy's Red Scare

A flurry of tense activity between the United States and the Soviet Union, and more broadly, the threat of communism, at the beginning of 1950 had set the American people on edge. Knowledge that the Soviet Union had acquired an atomic bomb in the summer of 1949 prompted the United States to rush to complete a hydrogen bomb.[4] State Department official Alger Hiss, who was first accused of espionage for the Soviets in 1948 by former communist Whitaker Chambers, was convicted of perjury in connection with the charges early that year.[5] On February 3, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover announced the capture of Manhattan Project physicist Klaus Fuchs, revealing him to be another Soviet spy.[6] These two high-profile cases seemingly proved that the communists were duplicitous and unrelenting in their infiltration of American institutions. It was against this backdrop of publicized communist disclosures that McCarthy gave his February 9 speech at Wheeling, West Virginia, as part of a series of speeches honoring Abraham Lincoln's birthday.[7] He took the opportunity of the innocuous event to claim that he had the names of more than two-hundred people in the State Department who were loyal to the Communist Party and the

---

[4] William T. Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare: A Reference Guide*, (Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011), 39.

[5] Hiss had been a part of Franklin Roosevelt's delegation to the 1945 Yalta Conference and temporary secretary general of the United Nations at its founding in 1945, and it was believed that his Communist ties were subverting American foreign policy, Andrew J. Dunar, *America in the Fifties*, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2006), 41-42.

[6] Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare*, 39.

[7] Ibid., 39.

Soviet Union in his possession; in this way, McCarthy fueled the anti-communist frenzy that was already present in America since the end of World War II and since the forging of the Truman Doctrine in March 1947.[8] McCarthy then spread his ideological fervor in speeches across America, often exaggerating the number of communist suspects or claiming to have been misquoted when his own numbers did not match up from speech to speech.[9] The early days of the Red Scare had illuminated some American's ability to easily submit to fearmongering, and McCarthy used this revelation to his advantage.

As Joseph McCarthy's speeches gained traction, critics began to doubt the validity of his claims. The day after a February 20 speech in the Senate in which his figures, yet again, did not match up, a committee and investigative subcommittee were formed to probe McCarthy's assertions.[10] Senator Millard Tydings headed the investigative subcommittee. A Democrat, he and his colleagues were suspicious of the Republican Wisconsinite's allegations, accusing him of "taking refuge in the Senate chamber, where he was immune from charges of slander."[11] In other words, Tydings believed that McCarthy was abusing his power with no regard for personal or professional repercussions, and was able to do so because of his position and the stranglehold of fear present in the American public. The Tydings Committee heard evidence from Secretary of State Dean Acheson, General Conrad Snow, who was chair of the State Department's Loyalty Board, and Owen J. Lattimore, Director of the Walter Hines Page School of International Relations at The Johns Hopkins University. McCarthy had accused the latter of being Alger

---

[8] Claims are varied on the exact number of suspected Communists McCarthy claimed to have with him, but most eyewitness accounts say 205, Ibid., 58.

[9] Ibid., 40.

[10] Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare*, 40.

[11] Dunar, *America in the Fifties*, 45.

Hiss' boss and a top Russian spy.[12] At every turn, McCarthy used the hearings and his zealous rhetoric to bolster attention to his cause. Lattimore and others testifying before the Tydings Committee refuted accusations of communist leanings, and the evidence presented failed to support any of McCarthy's accusations.[13] At the time of Margaret Chase Smith's speech, though, the Tydings Committee was still hearing evidence related to McCarthy's claims, and the senator from Wisconsin was seemingly untouchable.

A Man's World, The Boy's Club: Gender in Cold War Society and Politics

To properly appreciate the gravity of Margaret Chase Smith's speech is to acknowledge her presence as the only female in the Senate in 1950 and one of very few female legislators in national politics at that time. Concurrently, one must examine gender norms as they existed in post-World War II society and politics. Historian Susan M. Hartmann asserts that the continued perpetuation of gender stereotypes was an operative of the Cold War; generally, in order to maintain order in chaos, one must refrain from dissent, even in the expression of one's gender.[14] This meant promoting a traditional Judeo-Christian social framework in American society. In the years following World War II, many women who had worked during the war in industrial occupations returned to the home as veterans sought their old jobs.[15] If a woman worked during this time, she was almost certainly confined to choosing from "traditional female occupations"

---

[12] Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare*, 41-42.
[13] Ibid., 44.
[14] Susan M. Hartmann, "Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years," in *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*, ed. Joanne Meyerowitz (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 85.
[15] Ibid., 84.

such as secretary work and housekeeping.[16] According to post-war sensibilities, women were to adhere to the prevailing domestic ideal; that is, they were to stay home and care for their families. This idea mainly permeated white, suburban middle-class society. Although women gained the right to vote in 1919, by the beginning of the Cold War, support for women's issues had waned, and antifeminist sentiment consistent with enforced gender ideals was ever-present. Notably, in 1945 President Harry Truman had called women's rights " 'a lot of hooey.' "[17]

Under these conditions, then, it is not surprising that overall female representation in government was lacking, given the limited opportunities for success in the political arena. The women serving in national politics at this time were white women; women of color and, people of color generally, were mostly absent on the national stage. Writer Peggy Lamson, in her 1968 work on female politicians, succinctly described the reason for the reticence of women to become involved in politics: "...political and feminine are mutually exclusive. Politics by definition are aggressive. A woman seeking political office must therefore behave like a woman and not like a politician since aggressive women are of course not feminine. A woman who fights for her beliefs is shrill; a man is forceful."[18] Female politicians operated in a traditionally male sphere, and many chose to emphasize their femaleness as a result. Others such as Representative Frances Bolton, a Republican from Ohio, fought for equal treatment from her counterparts; for example, she insisted on being

---

[16] Ronald Allen Goldberg, *America in the Forties*, (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2012), 106.
[17] Goldberg, *America in the Forties*, 106.
[18] Peggy Lamson, *Few are Chosen: American Women in Political Life Today*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968), xxv.

called "Congressman," not "Congresswoman."[19] Congressman Bolton realized that not all female politicians shared her view, yet she was critical of those who emphasized their femininity. On other female lawmakers being called "Congresswoman," she said, " 'They think they're building up women that way. I say I do more for women than they do by being a woman Congressman,' " arguing that being an effective female politician had far more to do with policy stances than nomenclature.[20] Overall, the women who did take office during this time did so without a clear picture of what being a female politician looked like on a practical level.

Additionally, a woman's road to political office was often the product of appointments and special elections. During Margaret Chase Smith's first term in the House of Representatives, at which time she was her husband's hand-selected successor, there were only seven females serving alongside her.[21] By the time Smith entered the Senate of her own volition in 1949, only six women had gone into that chamber before her.[22] Of the six, only one, Senator Gladys Pyle of South Dakota, was elected via special election with no ties to a husband. Four were appointed to fill their husband's seats, and Senator Dixie Bibb Graves of Alabama was

---

[19] Not coincidentally, she was one of Margaret Chase Smith's closest friends in Washington, Janann Sherman, *No Place for a Woman: A Life of Senator Margaret Chase Smith*, (Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2000), 56; Lamson, *Few are* Chosen, 33.

[20] Lamson, *Few are Chosen*, 33.

[21] In addition to Smith, members were: Mary Norton (D-New Jersey), Caroline O'Day (D-New York), Edith Nourse Rogers (R-Massachusetts), Frances Bolton (R-Ohio), Jessie Sumner (R-Illinois), and Jeanette Rankin (R-Montana), Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 55.

[22] Rebecca Latimer Felton (D-Georgia, 1922), Hattie Wyatt Carraway (D-Arkansas, 1931-45), Rose McConnell Long (D-Lousiana, 1936-37), Dixie Bibb Graves (D-Alabama, 1937-38), Gladys Pyle (R-South Dakota, 1938-39), and Vera Calahan Bushfield (R-South Dakota, 1948).

selected by her husband, Alabama Governor Bibb Graves, to fill a vacancy in 1937.[23] By the Cold War era, there were more female Congressional members, but many had gone through the same processes as their predecessors to earn their seats.[24] Through the examination of gender and political intersection in a burgeoning Cold War society, it becomes clear that Margaret Chase Smith's unique position as a woman in politics increased the significance of her remarks on June 1, 1950.

The Lady from Maine

Margaret Chase Smith once joked that as her husband's secretary in Congress, she was the product of nepotism.[25] However, throughout her life, she was widely known as an intrepid crusader and hard worker, and someone who was respected on the merits of her ideas and the fierceness of her convictions. She was born on December 14, 1897, in her native Skowhegan, Maine. From the age of thirteen, Smith worked odd jobs, including a stint as a telephone operator in Skowhegan, where she met her future husband, Clyde Smith.[26] Clyde, a local politician in Skowhegan, gave her a

---

[23] "Women Senators," United States Senate, https://www.cop.senate.gov/senators/ListofWomenSenators.htm.

[24] More women would run in subsequent years for national seats, but until the mid-1960s, this demographic was almost exclusively limited to white women. When women of color did run and hold national office, they were still disproportionately underrepresented and disenfranchised as a whole.

[25] Frank Graham, Jr., *Margaret Chase Smith: Woman of Courage*, (New York: The John Day Company, Inc., 1964), 28.

[26] Clyde, divorced, rumored womanizer, and twenty-one years Margaret's senior, would call in every night at a quarter to eight to inquire about the time. It was through these interactions that the two got to know one another, Patricia Ward Wallace, *Politics of Conscience: A biography of Margaret Chase Smith* (Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1995), 10.

part-time job recording tax assessments. Of this experience, Smith later said that she " 'learned a great deal about politics in those days.' "[27] Married in May 1930, Smith followed Clyde to Washington after his election to the House of Representatives in 1936.[28] In her husband's employ, Smith conducted research on timely legislative issues, and became knowledgeable on a range of topics, especially labor legislation. Clyde won reelection, but suffered a major heart attack in April 1940 that left him on his deathbed. In his final hours, he named his wife as his preferred political successor, and she took his place after a special election was held.[29]

Margaret Chase Smith quickly earned a reputation in the House for her "plainspokenness, frankness, sincerity, independence, honesty, integrity, steadfastness, [and] courage."[30] She was unafraid to vote outside party lines, which lead The *New York Times* to comment " 'She has a mind of her own and uses it...she's a party all by herself.' "[31] Smith did not wish to use her gender to her advantage. Speaking during her later tenure as Senator, she said: " 'I've never asked for privileges as a woman, I never accept privileges as a woman, and I've never been given privileges as a woman. I

---

[27] Wallace, *Politics of Conscience*, 13.

[28] Clyde originally had aspirations to run for the Maine governorship; bowing to party wishes, he ran instead for the House, Graham, *Margaret Chase Smith*, 27-28; Wallace, *Politics of Conscience*, 31.

[29] Initially hesitant to accept the role, it was Clyde's physician, Georgian Dr. Paul F. Dickens, that convinced Margaret that she was the best fit to replace Clyde, Graham, *Margaret Chase Smith*, 29.

[30] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 51.

[31] Ibid., 84.

accept my responsibilities, do my homework and carry myself as a member of the Senate—never as a woman member of the Senate.' "[32]

During her first term in the House, Smith was assigned to the Education Committee.[33] This was not random. Smith biographer Janann Sherman asserts that political leaders purposefully placed women on committees that encouraged a "sexual division of political labor" in issues such as health, childcare, and education, as those were thought to be women's areas of expertise.[34] Smith, whether she realized this strategy or not, spent minimal time on the committee. When the opportunity came, she sought another post, and ultimately ended up on the Naval Affairs Committee.[35] During this time, America went to war in Europe, and Smith's committee handled timely issues. After almost a decade in the House, she used her wartime Naval Affairs Committee experience to appeal to Maine voters in 1948 when she ran for the Senate. She beat a field of well-funded veteran politicians for

---

[32] Although Smith did not consider herself a feminist and did not prefer to think of her gender as a component of her political decisions, it is nevertheless inextricably tied to the treatment she received while serving in government. Though somewhat limited in her role as a female Senator, there was a degree of privilege afforded Smith by virtue of her position as a middle-class white woman that others in her position might not have had, Lamson, *Few are Chosen*, 28-29.

[33] During the first meeting of the Committee, all the men stood up when Smith entered, which men did as a sign of respect for women at the time. She hoped that they would come to regard her as a normal member, but this would take time. Said Smith of coping with implicit and explicit gender bias in her early political career: " 'I ignored any discrimination. I never, never acknowledged it. Never,' " Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 55.

[34] Ibid.

[35] It was during this time she met and became good friends with Bill Lewis, who would later become her aide and help write the "Declaration of Conscience."

the job, and in the process became the first woman to serve in both chambers of Congress. Her unflappable determination, prior legislative experience, and the subtle influence of existing gender stereotypes in her career lends perspective on Margaret Chase Smith's persona and the impetus that compelled her to take a stand against McCarthy during her freshman term in the Senate.

"I would like to speak briefly..."

At the intersection of fear, gender, and McCarthyism lies the "Declaration of Conscience." Smith biographer Gregory Gallant notes that the speech was given through "a desire to restore civility to the United States Senate" in light of recent attacks by McCarthy on the Senate floor.[36] It is important to clarify that Margaret Chase Smith was not against the purge of potential Soviet spies from the United States government; she recognized the threat to national security that might accompany communist infiltration. She did not object to McCarthy's general goal of purging communist spies, but rather to the coarse methods by which he pursued his often-unsubstantiated allegations and lack of proof presented when pressed. Once, before giving her speech, Smith asked to see papers that claimed to list communist spies that McCarthy had touted on the Senate floor. He responded with a defiant " 'Why? Don't you believe me?' "[37] When she expressed concern that McCarthy was not telling the truth, he gave her several copies that seemed to be legitimate, but Smith was unable to see " 'how they clearly proved his charges.' "[38] At the time, Smith labeled her inability to understand as a mental " 'deficiency' "on her part, attributing it

[36] Gregory P. Gallant, *Hope and Fear in Margaret Chase Smith's America: A Continuous Tangle*, (London: Lexington Books, 2014), 126.
[37] Wallace, *Politics of Conscience*, 101.
[38] Wallace, *Politics of Conscience*, 101.

to the fact that since she was not a lawyer like McCarthy, she might not be able to perceive the legal justifications of his argument.[39]

As McCarthy's rhetoric became increasingly damaging to the credibility of the larger anti-communist mission within the government and to the sanity of the American people, Margaret Chase Smith became disillusioned by the witch hunt and felt compelled to take action; others considered her the best person to take on McCarthy.[40] She was solicited from March until May by those she termed " 'earnest liberals' " to make a speech, chiefly by Ed Hart, member of the Senate Radio Correspondents' Gallery, and newspaper columnist Doris Fleeson.[41] Hesitant about writing a speech critical of the McCarthy machine, Smith's aide, Bill Lewis, encouraged her to send out an invitation for other Republicans to endorse the speech.[42] The final list was comprised of Republicans Charles Tobey of New Hampshire, George Aiken of Vermont, Wayne Morse of Oregon, Irving Ives of New York, Edward Thye of Minnesota, and Robert Hendrickson of New Jersey.[43] During Memorial Day weekend, Smith and Bill Lewis discussed strategy while driving to Maine, and the speech was drafted at her dining room table.[44]

---

[39] Implicit in claims of deficiency is a prevailing notion of a woman's limited capacity for understanding in traditional men's spheres, which would extend to national security and general political affairs, Ibid., 101.

[40] There is a fringe theory that Smith's decision to speak out against McCarthy was partly motivated by her discontentment that McCarthy was not romantically interested in her. Almost all historians discard this theory wholesale, as it has no basis in fact, Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare*, 46.

[41] Wallace, *Politics of Conscience*, 102.

[42] Ibid., 102.

[43] Morse would later switch parties in his subsequent political career, but at the time of the speech, he was a Republican, Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 18.

[44] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 110.

The "Declaration of Conscience" was structured in such a way that grounded Smith's argument in her unique position as a Republican, woman, Senator, and American. The confluence of identities informed the speech as she issued a strong rebuke against sensationalism, smear, and incivility. As a Republican, Smith hoped to see her party overtake the Democratic majority, but not if it "embrac[ed] a philosophy that lack[ed] political integrity [and] intellectual honesty," a philosophy that Smith reasonably meant as one similar to McCarthy's tactics. [45] In one short mention of her gender, Smith wondered aloud how women—specifically "mothers, wives, sisters and daughters"—felt about "the way in which members of their families have been politically mangled in Senate debate."[46] As a Senator, Smith disapproved of "the way in which the Senate ha[d] been made a publicity platform for irresponsible sensationalism."[47] Smith hoped, as an American, to see the "nation recapture the strength and unity it once had when [it] fought the enemy instead of [itself]."[48] Margaret Chase Smith used each identity to call attention to what she perceived as problems in and out of the chamber and to advocate a more civil path forward.

The speech began by calling McCarthy's actions indicative of a larger "...national condition. A national feeling of fear and frustration that could result in national suicide and the end of everything that we Americans hold dear."[49] These opening words highlighted the severity of McCarthy's rhetoric, placing it in the broader context of American Cold War hysteria. Smith then narrowed in on Senate actions, imploring all members to "do some real soul searching and weigh [their] consciences" about the ways in which they might be "using or abusing [their] individual powers and

---

[45] Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 15.
[46] Ibid., 16.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 17.
[49] Ibid., 12-13.

privileges."[50] Criticizing those who "shout the loudest about Americanism," she stated to the Senate chamber that being an American should not mean being afraid to speak one's mind without fear of being labelled as " 'Communists' or 'Fascists' by their opponents."[51] Candidly, she condemned the Senate for advancing the fear in American society: "Today our country is being psychologically divided by the confusion and the suspicions that are bred in the United States Senate to spread like cancerous tentacles of 'know nothing, suspect everything' attitudes."[52] She reminded her audience that while exposing Soviet spies within the government was a necessary act, it should not be conducted at the cost of "hate and character assassination sheltered by the shield of congressional immunity."[53] In a thinly veiled attack on McCarthy, Smith eloquently stated: "It is strange that we can verbally attack anyone else without restraint and with full protection... [s]urely we should be able to take the same kind of character attacks that we 'dish out' to outsiders."[54]

Smith did not only target Joseph McCarthy and Senate practices, but also condemned the Democratic Truman administration and admonished her own party. She attacked the administration for its failure to "provide effective leadership," calling it complacent "to the threat of communism here at home and the leak of vital secrets to Russia."[55] Smith declared that these missteps gave Republicans the chance to regain power in government. Yet, she did not want to see Republicans embrace McCarthy's lack of integrity and intellectual honesty in a potential victory; to do so would mean, as she said, to "ride to political victory on the Four Horsemen of

---

[50] Ibid., 13-14.
[51] Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 14.
[52] Ibid., 15.
[53] Ibid., 13.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid., 15.

Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear."[56] Smith and her fellow signees advocated, among other things, a putting aside of political differences to focus on "thinking patriotically as Americans about national security based on individual freedom" instead of falling prey to "totalitarian techniques" that would play "directly into the Communist design of 'confuse, divide and conquer.' "[57] In this way, Smith squarely placed herself as a bipartisan who wished to see decency and civility restored to the Senate and America at large, having no qualms about lambasting colleagues and institutions that she found antithetical to her interpretation of American values.

America Reacts

Joseph McCarthy sat and listened to Margaret Chase Smith's fifteen-minute speech, fully aware that he was the subject. When Smith finished, she expected that McCarthy would make a rebuttal, but he quietly slipped away from the chamber instead.[58] In fact, the only responses came from Alexander Smith and Robert Hendrickson of New Jersey, Herbert Lehman of New York, and Millard Tydings.[59] All the remarks praised her, but Tydings qualified his praise, knowing that Smith had also attacked his and other Democrats' response to McCarthy.[60] After she made her speech, she herself left the floor to travel to Florence, Italy, as part of a bipartisan group to attend the Fifth Session of the General Conference of UNESCO.[61] Despite the relatively low profile the speech received the day it was given, reactions would continue in abundance in the coming days.

---

[56] Ibid., 15-16.
[57] Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 16-18.
[58] Ibid., 18.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 111.

A bevy of mail arrived from across America in response to the speech, eight-to-one in Smith's favor.[62] The *Chicago Sun-Times* declared that the speech contained " 'the ring of Lexington and Valley Forge, of the Gettysburg Address, of the American classroom, of the American home, the American Sunday school and the American church.' "[63] For the most part, the media response was positive given the speech's content. Smith's home state newspapers were largely favorable.[64] Running the story on Friday, June 2, many news publications ran headlines on the first or second pages that simply alluded to the event: "7 Senate Republicans Assail 'Smearing,' Exploiting 'Fear' " (*The Washington Post*), "GOP Senator Blisters Both Major Parties" (*The Hartford Courant*), and "MCCARTHY HIT IN SENATE" (*The Boston Daily Globe*). The *New York Times* ran a straightforward headline that read, "Seven G.O.P. Senators Decry 'Smear' Tactics of McCarthy."[65] Beside the story was a picture of a stoic-looking Margaret Chase Smith.

Notably, like many of the stories that followed, the *New York Times* emphasized Smith's gender, calling her the Senate's "only woman member."[66] Similarly, the sub-headline of that Friday's *Christian Science Monitor* read "Mrs. Smith Leads 'Bolt,' " and mentioned her voice in the chamber as being "low and emotion-charged" in rebuking McCarthy's methods, subtly implying that since she was a woman,

---

[62] Graham, *Margaret Chase Smith*, 77.
[63] Eric R. Crouse, *An American Stand: Senator Margaret Chase Smith and the Communist Menace, 1948-1972* (Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010), 26.
[64] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 112.
[65] William S. White, "Seven G.O.P. Senators Decry 'Smear' Tactics of McCarthy." *New York Times*, Jun 2, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/111710994?accountid=11012.
[66] Ibid.

she might be prone to a hysterical outburst.[67] Under a section titled "Democrats Chortle," The *Monitor* did consider that Smith's statement was an important one, not only due to the fact that it was essential to address the methods used to capture communists and to check the Democrats, but because it had "the inherent drama of the only woman member of the Senate appealing to the conscience of an all-male body."[68] Even those publications that were supportive of the speech drew attention to Smith's gender in one way or another, even though Smith's speech only mentioned her gender as but a small facet of her argument.

Other publications treated Smith's statement as a lecture, employing distinctly sexist overtones. Some ran headlines such as "Lady Senator Tongue-Lashes McCarthy & Co." (*New York* News) and "Mrs. Smith, Only Woman Senator, Flays Republican Leadership" (*Burlington Labor News*, Iowa).[69] The *Albuquerque Journal*'s headline read simply "Senators Lectured On Inquiry Tactics By Margaret Smith."[70] In a reprint of a *Washington Post* story, the *Nebraska State Journal* ran this headline: " 'Wanton' Boys Chastened by Smith Speech."[71] In the story that followed,

---

[67] Richard L. Strout, "Eight Republican Senators Repudiate 'McCarthyism," *The Christian Science Monitor*, June 2, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/508203373?accountid=11012.

[68] Strout, "Eight Republican Senators Repudiate 'McCarthyism.' "

[69] Crouse, *An American Stand*, 27.

[70] "Senators Lectured On Inquiry Tactics by Margaret Smith," *Albuquerque Journal*, June 2, 1950, https://newscomwc.newspapers.com/image/158211179/?terms=margaret%2Bchase%2Bsmith&pqsid=94hJX6NI16c30TxkV0zUbQ%3A57000%3A1249133214.

[71] Doris Fleeson, "'Wanton' Boys Chastened by Smith Speech," *Nebraska State Journal*, June 2, 1950, https://newscomwc.newspapers.com/image/314434009/?terms=margaret%2Bchase%2Bsmith&pqsid=94hJX6NI16c30TxkV0zUbQ%3A221000%3A399185200.

Doris Fleeson praised Smith's "candor, honesty, and common sense," saying that when Smith spoke, "a strong and cleaning wind seemed to blow thru the historic chamber."[72] Allusions to a woman's duty were also made. The Senate was told to "keep its house clean," while another portion of the story featured a veteran senator who "said he hadn't felt so rebuked since he was in college and his mother took him to task for sowing some wild oats."[73] Though stories were intended to reflect positively on Smith, Fleeson and others took an angle that made Smith seem like a caricature of a stern schoolmarm instead of portraying her as a serious legislator addressing an important issue.

The most biting criticisms in the press of the speech, and of Smith more specifically, came from opinions and editorials from conservatives, who rebuked her as a foolish woman. From the *Chicago Daily Tribune* came accusations in the "Voice of the People" section that Republican senators were "Hiding Behind a Woman" and that "Mrs. Smith Should Apologize" for attacking McCarthy and fellow Americans without "know[ing] the facts."[74] The *Atlanta Constitution* published an opinion piece by journalist Westbrook Pegler that painted Smith's criticisms as an indication that she "took advantage of the special privilege of her sex" in order to hurt her party and "attract undeserved pleasant attention to herself."[75] Another editorial in the *Omaha Evening World*

---

[72] Fleeson was one of those who had originally persuaded Smith to make the speech in the first place, Ibid.

[73] Ibid.

[74] Mrs. C.W. Bressler-Pettis, "Margaret Chase Smith Should Apologize," *Chicago Daily* Tribune, June 13, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/177988864?accountid=11012; The Oldster, "Hiding Behind a Woman," *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 9, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/177928906?accountid=11012.

[75] Westbrook Pegler, "A Time to Stir the Mind," *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 19, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1533145533?accountid=11012.

Herald said that the " 'aggressive Soviet despotism' " that threatened America demanded more action than Smith's " 'feather dusters.' "[76] The *Saturday Evening Post* branded Smith " 'the Soft Underbelly of the Republican Party.' "[77] Whatever their intentions, critics of Margaret Chase Smith's speech played on gender norms and political ideology to discredit her.

The public and the media were quick to react to Smith's remarks; yet her intended target, Joseph McCarthy, stayed noticeably silent. His only public remark, quoted in the *Washington Post*, made clear his plans to continue the fight against communism: " '...this attempt to expose and neutralize those who are attempting to betray this country shall not stop regardless of what any individual or group in this Senate, or in the Administration, may do or say.' "[78] Privately, McCarthy told friends that he would not respond to Smith's charges because of her gender, saying " 'I don't fight with women senators.' "[79] He did, however, use a derogatory name among his friends for those who had signed the "Declaration of Conscience:" "Snow White and her Six Dwarfs."[80] In short, he had already decided that a female senator, no matter how authoritative, could not diminish his influence, and had thus disregarded her comments.

Elsewhere, Senate supporters praised Smith and the speech. Co-signer Irving Ives, quoted in the *Boston Sunday*

---

[76] Crouse, *An American Stand*, 28.
[77] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 112.
[78] Alfred Friendly, "McCarthy to Fight Reds Despite Attacks," *The Washington Post*, June 3, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/152303559?accountid=11012.
[79] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 111.
[80] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 111.

Globe, praised Smith for hitting " 'a home run.' "[81] He explained, " 'She was the one person who could have said what she did without making the fur fly in the Senate ...because her colleagues respect her, believe she spoke from deep conviction and had no primary political motives.' "[82] Others, such as co-signer Edward Thye, used the speech to implore the Republican party to develop a " 'responsible' " response to the Red Scare that was " 'destroying the Government.' "[83] Whereas McCarthy responded by doubling down on his previous tactics, Smith's supporters wished to use the speech to change the way America prosecuted suspected communists. At any rate, responses to the "Declaration of Conscience" were varied and colorful, from effusive praise to unequivocal rejection. None of these comments, though, would stop McCarthy from instilling fear into the American public.

The Consequences of Speaking Up

Ultimately, mere words were not enough to curb Joseph McCarthy's divisive rhetoric and abrasive approach to his Soviet witch hunt. Margaret Chase Smith had chosen signatories to the "Declaration of Conscience" not only for their constituencies' varied geographical locations, but also for her confidence that they "shared her conviction about the danger of McCarthy's guilt-by-accusation technique."[84] Before the end of June, though, four of the co-signers had publicly re-

---

[81] "Ives Says Mrs. Smith 'Hit a Home Run' on Senator McCarthy," *Boston Daily Globe*, June 4, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/821315693?accountid=11012.
[82] "Ives Says Mrs. Smith 'Hit a Home Run' on Senator McCarthy."
[83] "Thye Asks all GOP Senators to Take Stand on Red Probe," *The Washington Post*, June 4, 1950, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/152248318?accountid=11012.
[84] A. Robert Smith, *A Tiger in the Senate: The Biography of Wayne Morse*, (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962), 263.

versed their support. Whether they feared the ire of their constituents or the retaliation of McCarthy, Janann Sherman writes that the Senators who defected vehemently asserted that any endorsement of Smith's statement should not be a reflection of their feelings toward McCarthy.[85] Senator Ives, who had publicly supported Smith weeks earlier, now said that he was " 'in full sympathy with the attitude of the senator from Wisconsin' " and praised him for his " 'constructive approach' " to the communist problem.[86] Senator Thye, who had called upon the Republicans to reach a consensus on the Red Scare issue, now said that McCarthy had " 'performed a service to his country and his state' " through his actions.[87] Senators Tobey and Hendrickson capitulated after McCarthy turned his ire on them; Senator Aiken distanced himself from Smith but remained friendly.[88] Only Wayne Morse stayed committed to the statement.[89] Historian David Oshinsky notes that, "Politically speaking, the Declaration had no real impact. For one thing, its focus was too narrow... For another, its sponsors were essentially a leaderless band."[90] In other words, the speech was effective rhetorically and as a piece of political posturing, but its supporters had no real plan of action to impede McCarthy's conduct, even if the sentiments were sincere. This contributed to the ease in which the Declaration's original supporters were able to escape a stauncher commitment to curbing McCarthy's witch

---

[85] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 113-114.
[86] Ibid., 114.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Ibid.
[89] Two of Morse's biographies, *The Tiger in the Senate* by A. Robert Smith and *Wayne Morse: A Political Biography* by Mason Drukman, mention Morse signing Smith's "Declaration," but woefully inadequate attention is paid. This perhaps alludes to the degree to which others believed the statement mattered in the grand scheme of things, Ibid.
[90] David M. Oshinsky, *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy*, New York: The Free Press, 1983, 165.

hunt. After her male counterparts were flayed in public opinion, it was clear that, for the most part, Smith stood alone against McCarthy.

Margaret Chase Smith did not back down against McCarthy, but she did not escape her attack unscathed; she paid dearly for taking a stand against the Wisconsin Senator. True to his bully tactics, instead of taking Smith on directly as he would have done had she been a man, McCarthy stripped her of an important committee assignment in January 1951. Smith recounted how she learned she had been removed from the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee: He did it by having a member of his staff deliver to my office, after 6 P.M. on the eve of the full committee meeting on subcommittee assignments, a copy of the memo which he had prepared for all Republican members with respect to subcommittee assignments. The door of my office was locked. McCarthy's staff member put the letter under the door. However, I was in that office.[91]

Conscious of the fact that this was retribution for her speech, Smith tried to reverse the decision by going to the Chairman of the Executive Expenditures Committee.[92] McCarthy was unflappable, claiming that her replacement, freshman Senator Richard Nixon, had more investigative experience than Smith as a former member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.[93] Smith was outranked by McCarthy and thus unsuccessful. Not content to remove her from a committee, McCarthy sought to oust Smith from the Senate altogether. In 1954, McCarthy channeled support for Robert Jones in the Maine Senate primary, hoping that this time he could exact revenge on Smith, but she defeated Jones

---

[91] Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 21-22.
[92] Ibid.
[93] Nixon's appointment, however, would ignite and sustain his own anti-communist fervor, causing his star to rise, Ibid.

by a five-to-one margin.[94] Margaret Chase Smith was thus granted more time to continue her fight in the legislature.

Smith and the signers to the "Declaration of Conscience" were not the only senators to feel McCarthy's wrath; bolstered by his increased power, McCarthy went after the very committee that tried to investigate him. Senator Millard Tydings, who had been investigating McCarthy and his claims, released the committee's statement on July 17, 1950. Signed by all three Democrats on the Committee, it outlined the charges McCarthy had lodged against suspected communists and concluded that there was no evidence to pursue charges.[95] The statement called McCarthy's tactics as "'perhaps the most nefarious campaign of half-truths and untruths in the history of this republic.' "[96] McCarthy publicly railed against the findings and argued that it even advanced communist interests.[97] It did not help that the report was only signed by Democrats; McCarthy spun this into a partisan attack rather than a legitimate issue.[98] In addition to lodging public criticism, McCarthy sought ultimate revenge by providing funding and consultants for Tydings' opponents during the 1950 election.[99] Tydings lost, further cementing McCarthy's image as an unstoppable force.[100] Until his official censure in December 1954, McCarthy would go on to

---

[94] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 136.
[95] Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare*, 50.
[96] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 114.
[97] Walker, *McCarthyism and the Red Scare*, 50.
[98] Ellen Schrecker, *Many are the crimes: McCarthyism in America*, (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1998), 249.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Tydings's loss is made all the more remarkable by the fact that President Franklin D. Roosevelt had tried, unsuccessfully, to oust the Senator after he opposed the President's relief legislation in 1938. Where FDR, a president, failed, McCarthy, a senator, succeeded, demonstrating the sheer force of power that McCarthy wielded at that time, William E. Leuchtenburg, "Franklin D. Roo-

perpetuate his harmful anti-Communist rhetoric largely unchecked.

Legacies: Margaret Chase Smith, the "Declaration of Conscience," and the Cold War

The "Declaration of Conscience" catapulted Margaret Chase Smith's name into celebrity. It made an adversary out of Joseph McCarthy. It is listed as one of the top one-hundred American speeches of the 20th century.[101] Yet the speech and its contents failed to make a lasting impact on Red Scare discourse. Some, like Smith biographer Patricia Ward Wallace, credit the outbreak of the Korean War in late June 1950 with giving McCarthy an advantage over his critics as the conflict validated his crusade against communism.[102] The fear already instilled in the American people continued unchecked by rational thinking and sensible legislation. The "Declaration of Conscience" receded into memory as a relic of judicious consideration.

Yet, fear is only one component of the speech's failure to impact the broader conversation; gender is inextricably tied to its fate as well. Financier Bernard Baruch was quoted the day after the speech as saying, "If a man had made the Declaration of Conscience, he would be the next President of the United States."[103] Since Smith made the speech, critics

---

sevelt: Domestic Affairs," Miller Center at the University of Virginia, July 24, 2018, https://millercenter.org/president/fdroosevelt/domestic-affairs.

[101] The list was compiled by researchers at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and Texas A&M University, reflecting the opinions of 137 leading scholars of the American public address. The speech itself is listed at #41, "Top 100 American speeches of the 20th century," University of Wisconsin, https://news.wisc.edu/archive/misc/speeches/.

[102] Wallace, *Politics of Conscience*, 110.

[103] Smith, *Declaration of Conscience*, 1.

discredited her according to prevailing gender perceptions. Even supporters could not help but emphasize her gender. In an era when to be a woman was to confine oneself to the domestic sphere, Margaret Chase Smith, who looked at gender as a component of politics but not its centerpiece, took a stand against what she perceived as a problem that she could help remedy. Not many other politicians could boast the same commitment to their convictions, before or after Smith's time.

Margaret Chase Smith remained in the Senate for another twenty-three years until Bill Hathaway defeated her in 1972, staying true to her principles and voting her conscience until the end. In 1964, she ran for President of the United States. Announcing her candidacy among female company at the Women's National Press Club on January 28, Smith noted that the odds were against her, including her gender. Yet she saw those "reasons advanced against [her] running as challenges."[104] Harkening back to the summer of 1950, gender played a role in her presidential candidacy, with some calling her interest in military issues " 'Amazonian' " and wondering whether she would put " 'chintz in the oval office, perfume in the cabinet room, [and] colored ribbons on congressional bills.' "[105] Nevertheless, Smith won over 26 percent of the vote in Illinois against Senator Barry Goldwater and held 27 votes at the Republican National Convention that summer.[106] Until the day she permanently retired from politics, Margaret Chase Smith challenged conventional while simultaneously working within the system, and in the process provided other women the opportunity to do the same in both congressional and presidential bids.

---

[104] Marjorie Hunter, "Margaret Chase Smith Seeks Presidency," *New York Times*, January 28, 1964, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115664591?accountid=11012.
[105] Sherman, *No Place for a Woman*, 187.
[106] Ibid., 191, 198.

As a politician, Smith served the people of Maine for thirty-two years in the House and Senate. Those who came after her recognized the impact she had on their own political careers. Olympia Snowe followed in Smith's footsteps, serving as Representative from Maine's 2nd District, Smith's constituency, from 1979-1995, and as Senator from 1995 until 2013. Upon Smith's death in 1995 at the age of 97, Snowe paid tribute to Smith in the Senate chamber, praising her for her "courage, bravery, integrity, and pioneering spirit."[107] Presently, Susan Collins is serving as Senator from Maine, having filled that seat since 1997, and there are more women serving in both houses of Congress than ever before. Just eight years after Smith's groundbreaking run for President, Shirley Chisholm became the first black woman to seek the Presidency for herself in 1972. More recently, Hillary Clinton sought the nation's highest public office in 2008 and again in 2016, becoming the first woman to earn the nomination of a major political party.

The Cold War-era gender stereotypes of Smith's day are slowly being replaced, and a new, more politically-engaged, and more diverse generation of women is taking shape, in part because of the strides Smith and others have made in female political representation. The political landscape and legislative makeup have changed since Smith's time in office, but much has remained the same. As elected women continue to make advances in politics in an age fraught with the tension and division reminiscent of the Cold War, they would do well to remember the legacy of Margaret Chase Smith: to speak and vote with their conscience, regardless of popularity or expediency, keeping the needs of the American people above their own.

---

[107] "Tribute to Senator Margaret Chase Smith," Congressional Record, Vol. 141, No. 9, June 6, 1995, https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record/1995/06/06/senate-section/article/S7713-6.

Works Cited

Bressler-Pettis, Mrs. C.W. "Margaret Chase Smith Should Apologize." *Chicago Daily* Tribune, June 13, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/177988864?accountid=11012

Crouse, Eric R. *An American Stand: Senator Margaret Chase Smith and the Communist Menace, 1948-1972*. Plymouth: Lexington Books, 2010.

Drukman, Mason. *Wayne Morse: A Political Biography*. Portland: Oregon Historical Society Press, 1997.

Dunar, Andrew J. *America in the Fifties*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2006.

Fleeson, Doris. "'Wanton' Boys Chastened by Smith Speech," *Nebraska State Journal*, June 2, 1950. https://newscomwc.newspapers.com/image/314434009/?terms=margaret%2Bchase%2Bsmith&pqsid=94hJX6NI16c30TxkV0zUbQ%3A221000%3A399185200.

Friendly, Alfred. "McCarthy to Fight Reds Despite Attacks." *The Washington Post,* June 3, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/152303559?accountid=11012.

Gallant, Gregory P. *Hope and Fear in Margaret Chase Smith's America: A Continuous Tangle*. London: Lexington Books, 2014.

Goldberg, Ronald Allen. *America in the Forties*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 2012.

Graham, Jr., Frank. *Margaret Chase Smith: Woman of Courage*. New York: The John Day Company, Inc., 1964.

Griffith, Robert. *The Politics of Fear: Joseph McCarthy and the Senate*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970. Hartmann, Susan M. "Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years." In *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*, edited by Joanne Meyerowitz, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994.

Hunter, Marjorie. "Margaret Chase Smith Seeks Presidency." *New York Times*, January 28, 1964. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115664591?accountid=11012.

"Ives Says Mrs. Smith 'Hit a Home Run' on Senator McCarthy." *Boston Daily Globe*, June 4, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/821315693?accountid=11012.

Lamson, Peggy. *Few are Chosen: American Women in Political Life Today*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.

Leuchtenburg, William E. "Franklin D. Roosevelt: Domestic Affairs." Miller Center at the University of Virginia. July 24, 2018. https://millercenter.org/president/fdroosevelt/domestic-affairs.

McCarthy, Joseph. "Speech at Wheeling, West Virginia." In Ellen Schrecker, *The Age of McCarthyism: A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2002.

Oldster, The. "Hiding Behind a Woman." *Chicago Daily Tribune*, June 9, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/177928906?accountid=11012.

Oshinsky, David M. *A Conspiracy So Immense: The World of Joe McCarthy*. New York: The Free Press, 1983.

Pegler, Westbrook. "A Time to Stir the Mind." *The Atlanta Constitution*, June 19, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1533145533?accountid=11012.

Schrecker, Ellen. *Many are the crimes: McCarthyism in America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1998.

"Senators Lectured On Inquiry Tactics by Margaret Smith." *Albuquerque Journal*, June 2, 1950. https://news-comwc.newspapers.com/image/158211179/?terms=margaret%2Bchase%2Bsmith&pqsid=94hJX6NI16c30TxkV0zUbQ%3A57000%3A1249133214.

Sherman, Janann. *No Place for a Woman: A Life of Senator Margaret Chase Smith*. Piscataway: Rutgers University Press, 2000.

Smith, A. Robert. *A Tiger in the Senate: The Biography of Wayne Morse*. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1962.

Smith, Margaret Chase. *Declaration of Conscience*. Edited by William C. Lewis, Jr. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1972.

Steinberg, Peter L. *The Great "Red Menace:" United States Prosecution of American Communists, 1947-1952.* Westport: Greenwood Press, 1984.

Strout, Richard L. "Eight Republican Senators Repudiate 'McCarthyism." *The Christian Science Monitor,* June 2, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/508203373?accountid=11012.

"Thye Asks all GOP Senators to Take Stand on Red Probe." *The Washington Post,* June 4, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/152248318?accountid=11012.

"Top 100 American speeches of the 20th century." University of Wisconsin. https://news.wisc.edu/archive/misc/speeches/.

"Tribute to Senator Margaret Chase Smith." Congressional Record. Vol. 141, No. 9, June 6, 1995. https://www.congress.gov/congressional-record/1995/06/06/senate-section/article/S7713-6.

Walker, William T. *McCarthyism and the Red Scare: A Reference Guide.* Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO, 2011.

Wallace, Patricia Ward. *Politics of Conscience: A biography of Margaret Chase Smith.* Westport: Praeger Publishers, 1995.

White, William S. "Seven G. O. P. Senators Decry 'Smear' Tactics of McCarthy." *New York Times,* June 2, 1950. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/111710994?accountid=11012.

"Women Senators." United States Senate. https://www.cop.senate.gov/senators/ListofWomenSenators.htm.

Reading Flannery O'Connor and the Restrictive Femininity of the 1950s

Natalie Curry

When reading Flannery O'Connor, one finds it impossible to ignore the strong spiritualism that runs through all of her works. O'Connor was concerned with questions of faith and redemption, and thus these elements comprise the major themes of her stories. Though O'Connor was focused on religion, one can read her works from an alternate perspective, one that focuses on gender roles in the 1950s. Among the more pervasive images during that period was the white, middle-class, suburban housewife. O'Connor includes versions of this figure in her texts, but also exposes the dangers of adherence to this patriarchal ideal. The female characters she includes in her texts reveal dissatisfaction with strict gender norms and a willingness to explore alternate versions of femininity. While O'Connor may have been writing non-realist fiction, her female characters reflect elements of truth concerning the oppressive reality that women in her time faced. Through close analysis of O'Connor's most prominent female characters and the modes of femininity they present along with comparisons to other pictures of 1950s femininity, a complicated picture of O'Connor's own feminism emerges. O'Connor does not openly support female empowerment, but her female characters exemplify a desire to find alternate modes of being outside of gender norms and a discontent with the status quo.

While some may apply modern feminist theories to O'Connor's work, this paper will focus on the feminism of

O'Connor's own time and the historical contexts that surround her writing. When speaking of women's issues in the 1950's and 60s, the looming figure is Betty Friedan and her work, *The Feminine Mystique*. Friedan and O'Connor were contemporaries, with O'Connor's first novel published in 1952 and *The Feminine Mystique* published in 1963, but focusing on the decade earlier. According to critic Robert Donahoo, who explores the intersections of Friedan's and O'Connor's work, Friedan and O'Connor "focus their attention on the same kind of women."[1] Friedan's work explores false-happiness imposed by housewife culture, while O'Connor's work includes descriptions of female characters that subvert expectations of this contented passivity. The choices and fates of these characters align with Friedan's idea that the options offered to women in the 1950s were not satisfactory. It is important to note, however, that Friedan and O'Connor were both writing about a particular mode of femininity that applied mainly to white, middle to upper-class women of the time, and not a universal idea of femininity.

The ideal of 1950s womanhood as explained by Friedan is the American housewife, who is "healthy, beautiful, educated, concerned only about her husband, her children, her home."[2] This figure is also present in O'Connor's works, though the majority of O'Connor's female characters break from the ideal in one way or another. This ideal housewife is content in her roles only as wife and mother, with no grand ambitions or identity outside of the domestic space.

---

[1] Robert Donahoo, "O'Connor and *The Feminine Mystique*: "The Limitations That Reality Imposed."" In *"On the subject of the feminist business": Re-Reading Flannery O'Connor*, ed. Teresa Caruso and Peter Lang (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004), 12.

[2] Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, Norton Critical Edition, ed. Kristen Fermaglich and Lisa M. Fine (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991), 11.

However, Friedan describes the problems that arise when "No other road to fulfillment was offered to American women."[3] O'Connor's work addresses this problem as well, as her female characters are trapped by limited circumstances and choices, which sometimes results in violent outbursts. O'Connor was not as overt as Friedan in her criticism of patriarchal gender roles for women, but her writing still critiques the system that limits opportunities for women, while struggling to find an alternative to these seemingly inescapable gender norms. As will be discussed in the following paragraphs, O'Connor's female characters are punished by the narrative when they adhere too closely to the gender roles of the 1950s, but even those that break the bounds of housewifery are still trapped in a society that offers limited forms of expression outside the model described by Friedan.

O'Connor's female characters can be distilled into several basic groups, and I will explore two of the most predominant: mothers and rebellious daughters. The categorization of female characters as either mother or rebel shows the real limitations that women in the 1950s faced, as the female characters that attempt to exist outside of the norms are ultimately forced back into the status quo. However, in O'Connor's writing, no woman can perfectly inhabit gender expectations of the 1950s, revealing O'Connor's critique of the false limitations placed on women. Looking at both traditional mothers and the more rebellious daughters further expands O'Connor's critique, as both sets of characters diverge from gender norms. The mothers, the characters that most ostensibly comply with gender roles, are traditional to the point of ridicule, but most do not submit fully to the bounds of the domestic sphere as do the housewives described by Friedan. The rebels fight against the system of gender oppression, but are still punished for their actions, portraying seemingly ines-

[3] Friedan, 18.

capable circumstances. In her characters' inabilities or refusal to adhere to strict gender roles O'Connor reveals some of her own dissatisfactions with the femininity of her time.

The mothers of O'Connor's stories initially seem to embody ideals of 1950s womanhood, but the punishing conclusions to their narratives complicate these portrayals of domestic femininity. The quintessential mother of tradition figure is the Grandmother of "A Good Man Is Hard to Find." The Grandmother, who remains nameless, is concerned with appearances and politeness above all else, putting on her best clothes for the fateful road trip to ensure "anyone seeing her dead on the highway would know at once that she was a lady."[4] Her pleading and eventual death may cause a shift in the murderous Misfit, but her character remains stalwart, as she believes in the power of good breeding to the end. After all, she knows the Misfit "wouldn't shoot a lady."[5] The humor of the Grandmother lies in her twisted realism, as she is a familiar character of performative gentility taken a step further. She believes that a known murderer "must come from nice people,"[6] and that her own politeness and respect might save her from the grisly fate of her family. She exemplifies the downsides of adherence to 1950s femininity, a femininity that is concerned with class, gentility, and politeness, which, in this case, results in death.

The mother in "A Good Man Is Hard to Find" is also a nameless, traditional figure of femininity that mirrors the listless figures Friedan explores. Donahoo argues that she is nameless because her "identity is submerged beneath that of

---

[4] Flannery O'Connor, "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 138.

[5] O'Connor, "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," 151.

[6] O'Connor, 147.

her husband and children."[7] The mother remains mostly silent until the end, when she politely responds, "Yes, thank you," when the Misfit asks her if she would like to join her husband in death[8], taking the role of passive wife to the extreme. She is unable to fight the horror that confronts her, marching off to death with a baby in her right arm, as her "left arm dangled helplessly" due to the preceding car crash.[9] The mother of this story is defined solely based on her maternal role, and unlike the Grandmother she doesn't have a comic personality, only a responsibility to care for her children. There isn't even a full description of the mother's appearance, besides that she looks "broad and innocent as a cabbage."[10] This mother figure is a prime example of the women Friedan describes as the ultimate product of the feminine mystique, women who have "no independent self to hide even in guilt; she exists only for and through her husband and children."[11] This type of mother figure, the one with no distinct personality, is perhaps the most pitiable of all the women portrayed in O'Connor's stories. She is tragic in her lack of selfhood, identity, and spirit. While the grandmother may be comically ridiculous, the mother is tragically forgettable.

These characters represent different elements of traditional femininity, with the grandmother the symbol of class and tradition and the mother the symbol of maternity, but

---

[7] Donahoo, "O'Connor and *The Feminine Mystique*: "The Limitations That Reality Imposed,"" 18.

[8] O'Connor, "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," 151.

[9] O'Connor, 151.

[10] O'Connor, "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," 137.

[11] Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 36.

both conform to fairly typical gender roles, are doomed to violent ends, and are not truly changed by O'Connor's signature spiritualism. The mother does not experience one of O'Connor's moments of grace, as she remains a figure of maternal devotion to the end. The Grandmother, on the other hand, does have a moment of realization, when she sees the Misfit as "one of my babies."[12] While there is a spiritual awakening due to the human connection that forms between the Misfit and the Grandmother, her moment of realization acts to facilitate the Misfit's more powerful moment of grace, as "The Misfit is touched by the Grace that comes through the old lady."[13] Additionally, the Grandmother's moment of spirituality is still connected to her role as a mother and caregiver, limiting her to primarily feminine roles. These two maternal figures exemplify O'Connor's concerns with adherence to strict gender roles, and especially women who refuse to diverge from these norms.

Along with an adherence to class, manners, and traditions, O'Connor's mother figures also have a strong drive to see their children, and particularly daughters, married. Mothers have the role of furthering the status quo in the next generation, but this action is punished in O'Connor's narrative much as adherence to class and traditional roles are in "A Good Man Is Hard to Find." As critic Natalie Wilson argues, O'Connor's depiction of traditional mother figures "can be read as serving to reveal the ways in which women as well as men pass on and enforce patriarchal discourse."[14]

---

[12] O'Connor, "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," 152.

[13] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter to John Hawkes 14 April 1960," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 1125.

[14] Natalie Wilson, "Misfit Bodies and Errant Gender: The Corporeal Feminism of Flannery O'Connor," in *"On the subject of the feminist business": Re-Reading Flannery O'Connor*, ed. Teresa

This can be seen in countless mothers, but particularly in the old woman of "The Life You Save May Be Your Own." The old woman, Lucynell, trained her daughter, also named Lucynell, to be a twisted version of the ideal 1950s housewife, teaching her to "sweep the floor, cook, wash, feed the chickens, and hoe."[15] Despite her claim that she would not "give her [Lucynell] up for a casket of jewels,"[16] the old woman encourages the marriage between Lucynell and Shiftlet, marketing her daughter as the ideal wife because she "can't sass you back or use foul language."[17]

The older Lucynell passes on the tradition of femininity through an emphasis on marriage and values like purity and deferential behavior, but this continuing legacy of gender norms leads to unhappiness for both the mother and the daughter. Considering the norms of the 1950s, the marriage between Shiftlet and Lucynell should constitute a happy ending, as through marrying off her daughter, the older Lucynell has fulfilled her maternal duties and ensured that her daughter adheres to gender traditions. However, O'Connor twists this narrative by revealing Shiftlet as a con man who abandons his new wife in a diner, branding her a "Hitch-hiker."[18] O'Connor chooses to portray not an ideal marriage of the 1950s, but instead the dangers that can occur from passing on traditional gender roles to the younger gen-

---

Caruso and Peter Lang (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004), 96.

[15] Flannery O'Connor, "The Life You Save May Be Your Own," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 176.

[16] O'Connor, "The Life You Save May Be Your Own," 176.

[17] O'Connor, 178.

[18] O'Connor, "The Life You Save May Be Your Own," 181.

eration. Another example of a mother trying to pass on traditions of femininity to her daughter can be seen in the unnamed "pleasant lady" from "Revelation."[19] This mother is rewarded for her adherence to tradition with a daughter who seems mentally unstable and who violently attacks the physical incarnation of traditional femininity—Mrs. Turpin. Clearly, strict obedience to gender roles is not a positive characteristic in O'Connor's world.

In crafting these representations of femininity, O'Connor was undeniably inspired by women of her time, and these real-life inspirations reveal some of the pressures of 1950s femininity in O'Connor's own life. When speaking about her writing process, O'Connor mentions, "the writer doesn't have to understand, only reproduce."[20] In following this philosophy, O'Connor reproduced women from her life in her texts, including representations of herself. O'Connor's letters provide a sense of her interactions with real women, and there are numerous comic examples that mirror moments from stories. For example, she describes in a letter her reaction to an old woman with "moist gleaming eye[s]" she met in an elevator, who makes her feel "exactly like the Misfit."[21] In this case O'Connor's life imitated her fiction. The influence of O'Connor's mother can also be seen in the stories, as Regina O'Connor was the figure of tradition and femininity in the author's life. O'Connor describes various interactions

---

[19] Flannery O'Connor, "Revelation," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 638, various.

[20] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter To A. 17 November 1956," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 1007.

[21] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter To A. 10 November 1955," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 969.

with her mother throughout her letters, but one of the most amusing is when O'Connor describes Regina's outrage at a critic's remark of "If this is really the unaided work of a young lady, it is a remarkable product."[22] Regina was not concerned that the critic was devaluing O'Connor's work due to her femininity, but was aghast that he "suppose[s] you're not a lady."[23] O'Connor recounts anecdotes of her life with her mother with humor, but Regina's role as a traditional mother is reflected in the characterization of mothers in O'Connor's writing.

The mother figures both in reality and in O'Connor's stories are tinged with comic ridiculousness that exists due to over-adherence to gender traditions. This ridiculousness can be seen particularly in the endings of several short stories, as most of the mother figures are revealed to the audience as idiotic or shallow. Despite the tragedy of the murders in "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," the reader may be inclined to agree with the Misfit that the Grandmother could have been a good woman if there "had been somebody there to shoot her every minute of her life" in order to stop her incessant prattling.[24] Additionally, the audience and O'Connor are able to laugh at the ridiculous Mrs. Turpin from "Revelation," with her preoccupation with "manners"[25] and class, as she gets her due in the form of Mary Grace's attack. Mrs. Turpin is not revealed to be a mother herself, but she functions in much the

---

[22] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter To Robert Lowell 2 May 1952," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 897.

[23] O'Connor, "Letter To Robert Lowell 2 May 1952," 897.

[24] O'Connor, "A Good Man Is Hard to Find," 153.

[25] O'Connor, "Revelation," 633.

same role, as a guardian of tradition and femininity. Characters like Mrs. Turpin and the Grandmother are punished and laughed at in the narrative because of their adherence to gender norms, indicating O'Connor's dissatisfaction with a society that perpetuated these roles for women.

Despite what seems to be a caricature of mothers who uphold patriarchal standards, a surprising element of many of the mothers in the short stories is their economic power, primarily through the ownership of land. Through these portrayals of female landowners, O'Connor presents female characters that both uphold and rebuff tradition, though ultimately patriarchal society reins them in. Many of the women own land in the absence of husbands or other male figures; they have usurped traditional plantation hierarchy. Mrs. Cope from "A Circle in the Fire" most exemplifies this new version of the landowner, though there are several other examples, including Mrs. May of "Greenleaf" and Mrs. McIntyre of "The Displaced Person," and Regina O'Connor, who owned a farm. Mrs. Cope is a conscientious landowner, "always worrying about fires in her woods"[26] and managing the gossipy Mrs. Pritchard. She is proud of her "work to save this place and work to keep it,"[27] and seems not to depend on any masculine figures. However, her world is ripped from her by the three boys who invade her land, despite her initial politeness and "pain" at the thought of the children going hungry. [28] Like the other female landowners, Mrs. Cope is not rewarded for her independence, but punished by an invading, masculine force, in her case, the three boys. Mr.

---

[26] Flannery O'Connor, "A Circle in the Fire," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 235.

[27] O'Connor, "A Circle in the Fire," 235.

[28] O'Connor, "A Circle in the Fire," 237.

Greenleaf's bull, another metaphor for masculine power, mauls Mrs. May, while Mrs. McIntyre is forced to give up her cows and her livelihood following the events with Mr. Guizac and Mr. Shortley in "The Displaced Person."

The overwhelming theme throughout these stories is that women who exercise power through a traditionally masculine means cannot keep it, and that the status quo of male domination must be restored. A prime example of this is when the bull of "Greenleaf" "buried his head in her [Mrs. May's] lap, like a wild tormented lover,"[29] representing an undoubtedly masculine force. Mrs. May is maimed, frozen in disbelief despite her power and assurance up to this point in the story, and order is restored by Mr. Greenleaf's shooting the bull "four times through the eye."[30] The female landowner is killed, and the status quo is reinstated by a patriarchal figure. In spite of this, by portraying so many female characters with the kind of independent economic power that accompanies landownership, O'Connor defies the traditional plantation structure and represents women that exercise both power and femininity. Mrs. May is class-conscious and sleeps in an "egg-white paste that drew the wrinkles out while she slept,"[31] but she also was able to take a run-down piece of land her late husband left her and "set herself up in the dairy business,"[32] despite knowing very little about country life. Mrs. May and the other landowners are not women who depend on their husbands for income, yet they are still

---

[29] Flannery O'Connor, "Greenleaf," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: Penguin Random House, 1988), 523.

[30] O'Connor, "Greenleaf," 524.

[31] O'Connor, 501.

[32] O'Connor, "Greenleaf," 508–509.

concerned with the traditional female dominions of class and domesticity. Mrs. Cope enacts the role of the concerned mother, and part of the reason her land is destroyed is because she decides to "keep out of their way" in regard to the three rowdy boys instead of asserting her power, as "Ladies don't beat the daylight out of people."[33]

These female landowners also inhabit unique positions in-between the working realm and the home. Friedan describes a split in the 1950s between idealized housewives and demonized career girls, but O'Connor's female landowners fit into neither category. Their livelihoods are deeply tied to the concept of home and they rely on some masculine labor, but this type of homeownership is far removed from suburban housewifery. Mrs. May is more concerned with the prospect of the bull "ruining her herd before morning" than with traditional domestic tasks like cooking or cleaning.[34] O'Connor's landowners are neither suburban housewives nor career women, thus contradicting the narrative of limited femininity of the 1950s. The consistent theme regardless of independence or power of the mother figures is that the narrative punishes them, either by making them ridiculous or by stripping them of their economic power. The female landowners in particular cannot exist within the bonds of a patriarchal society, as they are not easily categorized as traditional mothers or rebels.

While speaking about maternal figures, one must also mention the solitary character that stands apart: the reluctant mother, Ruby. Ruby, of "A Stroke of Good Fortune," is different from nearly any other female character in O'Connor's work. For starters, her story is devoted almost entirely to her. There are outside forces and interactions, but the entire narrative centers on Ruby's climbing the steps to her fourth-floor apartment and the various experiences she has

---

[33] O'Connor, "A Circle in the Fire," 242.

[34] O'Connor, "Greenleaf," 502.

along the way. Ruby is also distinct because she is married, but has absolutely no desire for children. Ruby is scarred by the memory of her mother, who "got deader with every" child she had, which Ruby attributes to her "ignorance."[35] Childbearing is not a wonderful or beautiful experience for Ruby, but one that is frightening, and robs the mother of her vitality and youth, which makes Ruby's realization that she is unwillingly pregnant all the more horrifying. This portrayal of motherhood is the complete opposite of popular conception of motherhood in the 1950s, the idea that women "can know fulfillment only at the moment of giving birth to a child."[36] Motherhood was seen as a woman's primary calling, an idea mirrored by Catholic thought of the time as well.

Motherhood as presented in this story is further complicated by the presence of birth control, which further reveals O'Connor's unease with the traditional modes of motherhood and femininity. Critic Aimee Wilson argues that Ruby's husband is a birth control salesman, as he sells "Miracle Products."[37] The traditional motherhood of the 1950s was more of a duty than a choice, one that was a "sacred occupation" in the eyes of many.[38] Most of O'Connor's mother figures embrace this "sacred" duty and are defined by mothering roles. Mrs. Hopewell still thinks of her 32-year-old

---

[35] Flannery O'Connor, "A Stroke of Good Fortune," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 186.

[36] Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 50.

[37] O'Connor, "A Stroke of Good Fortune," 184.

[38] Aimee Armande Wilson, "Southern Mother, Lethal Fetus; Or, How Birth Control Makes a Modernist out of Flannery O'Connor," *Genre* 47, no. 3 (2014): 407.

daughter "as a child,"[39] and she continues to take care of her into adulthood, a trend mirrored with several other mothers in O'Connor's texts who dote on adult children. Motherhood is a lifelong responsibility as portrayed in these texts and the media of the 1950s. And yet O'Connor, a devout Catholic, writes this story, in which the failure of birth control is more of a tragedy. Despite the not entirely serious tone of the story, Ruby's cries of "Noooo," as she lies whimpering on the floor after her discovery of the pregnancy are undoubtedly emotionally charged.[40] This story perhaps best conveys O'Connor's uneasiness with the forced gender roles of her time, but also their inevitability and the lack of feasible alternatives for women. O'Connor was not satisfied with "A Stroke of Good Fortune" as a story; on multiple occasions she complains that the story "don't appeal to me" and she "didn't want it" included in the collection *A Good Man Is Hard to Find*.[41] This could be due to its spliced nature, as Ruby was originally a character in *Wise Blood*. But as it stands, it is a story that cannot be said to be a positive portrayal of motherhood.

The inclusion of Ruby complicates notions of 1950s motherhood, as Ruby is neither a rebellious daughter nor a content mother. She is a devoted wife and homemaker, but resists children, the logical next step in adherence with expectations for women in the 1950s. O'Connor grappled with this story, but in the end, she kept working on it. Despite her

---

[39] Flannery O'Connor, "Good Country People," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 263.

[40] O'Connor, "A Stroke of Good Fortune," 195.

[41] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter To Sally and Robert Fitzgerald 10 June 1955," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: The Library of America, 1988), 939.

hesitancy concerning the final product, this struggle characterizes O'Connor's wider concerns regarding gender that subtly inform her female characters. While the presence of Ruby raises a number of questions regarding O'Connor's stance on motherhood, she is the exception to O'Connor's other mother figures, who continue to perform traditionally feminine roles even when they lead to tragic results.

When looking at the mother figures as a group, one must question if O'Connor is satisfied with patriarchal gender roles and what alternative forms of femininity exist. Donahoo suggests that "O'Connor herself does not seem to have accepted the plight of American women in the 1950s as unalterable,"[42] and this suggestion seems to be supported by the various women of the text, as none of the narratives conclude with ideal domestic femininity. As seen in the sections above, women who remain within the bounds of traditional femininity such as the Grandmother and mother of "A Good Man Is Hard to Find" are certainly not rewarded for their behavior. But neither are the mothers that push beyond these restrictions, such as the landowners of "A Circle in the Fire" and "Greenleaf." As I will explore at greater length, women who go even further beyond the boundaries of traditional gender roles are similarly punished. O'Connor may have envisioned more rebellious forms of femininity, but these female characters are still punished by the narrative much like the traditional female characters.

O'Connor's treatment of gender is further complicated by the female characters who overtly refuse conform to the expectations of 1950s womanhood and their connections to the women Friedan described and O'Connor herself. This final group of female characters, the rebels, rebuffs the shackles of tradition in favor of alternate ways of being. This rebellion takes several forms and faces a variety of consequences, which complicates O'Connor's seeming criticism of

---

[42] Donahoo, "O'Connor and *The Feminine Mystique*: "The Limitations That Reality Imposed,"" 26.

the traditional patriarchal system as seen through the more traditional female figures. The rebellious female characters are defined by their physical and intellectual excess, as they push beyond the boundaries of the roles inhabited by the mother figures. In terms of physical excess, this trait is most often seen through physical ugliness or deformity. Hulga from "Good Country People," with her artificial leg, is the most obvious example of a physically marked character, but none of O'Connor's physical descriptions of women are entirely favorable. Even the traditional mother figures are not described as beautiful, and often they have a distinctive physical characteristic, like Mrs. Pritchard's "black eyes that seemed to be enlarging all the time"[43] or Mrs. Freeman's expression that is "like the advance of a heavy truck."[44] It is a small act against the ideal of femininity of the 1950s that most of the female characters are not physically attractive, removing the sensuality associated with the object-of-desire housewife. However, the true rebels of O'Connor's stories move beyond physical appearance and manifest ugliness through actions.

Most of the rebellious characters choose to consciously exist outside of traditional roles, whether that choice is enacted through physical appearance, personality, or education. Monica Miller, in an article on female characters' ugliness, describes female characters "who consciously choose to be ugly, in both physical and behavioral senses of the word" and the rebellion present in this choice.[45] O'Connor's

---

[43] O'Connor, "A Circle in the Fire," 232.

[44] O'Connor, "Good Country People," 263.

[45] Monica Carol Miller, *Being Ugly: Southern Women Writers and Social Rebellion* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2017), 123.

characters often follow this path, choosing ugliness as an intentional rebuff towards society or expectations. Joy chooses to be renamed as Hulga, as she wants the "ugliest name in any language."[46] Similarly, Mrs. Turpin from "Revelation" pities Mary Grace, who chooses ugliness in terms of personality, as "it was one thing to be ugly and another to act ugly."[47] In the cases of Hulga and Mary Grace, the choice is to embrace ugliness instead of tame it, an act that Miller describes as a way to "rebel, express dissent, or refuse the role of wife and mother and their rigid gender expectations."[48] (123). While beauty is not a trait one would associate with many of O'Connor's female characters, ugliness is a characteristic beyond mere physicality, an action that marks a woman as outside of the norm. This otherness, according to Natalie Wilson, allows O'Connor's characters to "question, subvert, and transgress patriarchal authority".[49] Thus, the conscious choice of ugliness is not only a way to reject gender expectations for O'Connor's characters, but a statement against patriarchy as a whole.

However, several of the characters that choose to push beyond the boundaries of traditional femininity exist as caricatures or comic relief, not as fully inhabited or explored personas. Mary Grace, for example, hardly speaks in "Revelation," and exists to be a figure of irony and drama, not a real character with understandable desires or motives. She is more animal than human as her "raw face came crashing

---

[46] O'Connor, "Good Country People," 266.

[47] O'Connor, "Revelation," 637.

[48] Miller, *Being Ugly: Southern Women Writers and Social Rebellion*, 123.

[49] N. Wilson, "Misfit Bodies and Errant Gender: The Corporeal Feminism of Flannery O'Connor," 96.

across the table toward her [Mrs. Turpin], howling."[50] Mary Grace may be a dramatized caricature of female repression, but her frustrations towards women like Mrs. Turpin, who are obsessed with feminine ideals like class and politeness, represent some of O'Connor's own frustrations. Hulga and Mary Grace not only represent O'Connor's frustrations, but also mirror certain elements of O'Connor's home life. They are single, educated, and living at home with their old-fashioned mothers. O'Connor describes Hulga as a "projection of myself into this kind of tragic-comic action,"[51] as both are highly educated, yet stuck at home due to poor health, among other things. Hulga and O'Connor also share the same independent spirit, and unwillingness to bow to the effects of illness or disability. O'Connor writes about how she is "always glad to have the door held open,"[52] but that's all the help she needs despite her fight with lupus. Hulga gives Manley Pointer a "contemptuous look" when he insinuates she can't climb the ladder to the hay loft, and then proves him wrong as he watches "awestruck."[53] O'Connor and Hulga are defiant in the face of characteristics that differentiate them from the rest of society. However, the difference between O'Connor and Hulga or Mary Grace, is that the characters are allowed to take their frustrations with their society, and particularly the expectations of females within it, to their radical extremes.

---

[50] O'Connor, "Revelation," 644.

[51] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter To A. 30 September 1955," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: Penguin Random House, 1988), 959.

[52] Flannery O'Connor, "Letter To A. 28 June 1956," in *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, ed. Sally Fitzgerald (New York: Penguin Random House, 1988), 998.

[53] O'Connor, "Good Country People," 279.

The female rebels of O'Connor's stories voice their dissatisfaction with the restrictive gender system through a variety of means, and these fictional women enact frustrations that real women of the 1950s struggled to convey. According to Friedan, women of the 1950's experienced "tremendous relief when a feeling is finally out in the open,"[54] in this case the feeling of dissatisfaction with gender roles. Mary Grace's and Hulga's reactions represent this need for freedom after the frustrating bounds of traditional femininity, a representation that O'Connor takes to the extreme but that still mirrors the reality of her time. Hulga decides to seduce Manley Pointer in order to prove her "True genius" and scoffs at what she perceives to be his simplistic, religious nature.[55] The masculine, patriarchal force of Manley Pointer ultimately tricks Hulga, but she still rebels against social propriety by attempting to take an active role in the seduction and lying about her age. Mary Grace's frustrations take a more physical form, as she attacks Mrs. Turpin and is eventually branded a "lunatic."[56] Both characters' reactions to their situations reveal a futility in attempting to escape the roles prescribed by gender expectations. However, the very attempt and acknowledgment that traditional roles are not enough marks a departure from Friedan's exploration of repressed women who "try to deny this dissatisfied voice within themselves because it does not fit the pretty picture of femininity the experts have given them."[57] O'Connor was not one to conform to the Friedan ideal, as she "refused to play

---

[54] Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 24.

[55] O'Connor, "Good Country People," 276.

[56] O'Connor, "Revelation," 647.

[57] Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 19.

the role of the southern belle and declined to conform to cultural expectations of normal femininity,"[58] actions that are reflected in her semi-autobiographical characters. O'Connor did not express her dissatisfaction in as radical a way as Hulga or Mary Grace, the presence of these two characters shows O'Connor's awareness of the stifling pressures pushed upon women in the 1950s.

Despite O'Connor's engagement of a variety of female characters that represent varying adherence to gender norms, O'Connor's stories generally lack female perspectives that remark upon uniquely feminine issues. Nearly every story has at least a few throwaway female characters, but those that experience meaningful change or are at the center of O'Connor's signature revelations are few and far between. Critic Katherine Prown suggests that the lack of exploration into the feminine consciousness was intentional, as O'Connor "created as much distance as possible between herself and her female characters."[59] While there is certainly a disconnect between many of the female characters and the fiercely intelligent and independent O'Connor, O'Connor did insert herself into certain characters like Hulga and Mary Grace. However, in the majority of the stories, the lack of meaningful female perspectives in O'Connor's work is matched by a spiritual absence as well. While many of the male characters are defined by moments of reconsideration or grace, female characters are more often collateral on these spiritual journeys instead of participants. Prown writes that O'Connor "frequently shifts to focus instead on the male pro-

---

[58] N. Wilson, "Misfit Bodies and Errant Gender: The Corporeal Feminism of Flannery O'Connor," 99.

[59] Katherine Hemple Prown, *Revising Flannery O'Connor: Southern Literary Culture and the Problem of Female Authorship*, (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001), 45.

tagonist, thereby robbing female characters of the opportunity for genuine and meaningful salvation."[60] There are, of course, exceptions, but the spiritual salvation of female characters frequently depends on masculine forces, like Mr. Greenleaf's bull or Manley Pointer's betrayal. Women are not allowed to discover spirituality through their own means. This is yet another way that women are limited in O'Connor's narratives, but it is also clear that O'Connor recognized the pressures and issues that plagued women due to the constrictive expectations society placed on them.

When one considers O'Connor's engagement with gender politics, it is not enough to solely examine the female characters seen in O'Connor's published work, as many of her female characters changed drastically from manuscript to final publication. These changes reveal the social pressures acting on O'Connor as a female writer, and perhaps it is these pressures that inhibited her from further exploring the topic of alternate forms of femininity in her writing. As mentioned previously, Ruby was originally a character in *Wise Blood*. In the original manuscript of *Wise Blood,* female characters play a much larger role, as according to Prown "God essentially uses the female characters as the medium through which to reach Haze."[61] O'Connor's earlier manuscripts from her college days also reveal that "[a]t this point in her development as a writer, O'Connor was also able to take the lives of her lady characters seriously, without the hostile and often punishing tone that pervades much of her published work."[62] The shift towards male perspectives and punishing tone to-

---

[60] Prown, *Revising Flannery O'Connor: Southern Literary Culture and the Problem of Female Authorship*, 44.

[61] Prown, *Revising Flannery O'Connor: Southern Literary Culture and the Problem of Female Authorship*, 116.

[62] Prown, 39.

wards women occurred as O'Connor moved through graduate school and into the realm of publishing. Prown posits this shift was due to O'Connor's concerns with being a female writer, as she eliminated overtly female experiences and "turned instead to material she hoped might earn her distinction as a serious artist."[63] O'Connor was aware of the disadvantages of female authorship, and perhaps the reason she does not overtly explore gender issues is due to this concern of seriousness. Despite elimination of female perspectives, O'Connor still inserts characters that encourage discussion of gender roles and does not write characters that fully support the gender system of the 1950s in which she herself participated.

This shift by O'Connor away from female perspectives and topics was matched by a shift in mass-media publishing away from writing about the career girl and creation of the idealized housewife. Friedan describes the creation of the norm through women's magazines, as female issues became exclusively those within the home. There was no space in the writing of the 1950s for women to be fully capable characters, as the publishing industry returned to the ideal of the passive housewife of decades prior. Thus, O'Connor's elimination of more complex female characters not only marks her own desire to be branded a serious author, but also the industry as a whole's inability to imagine alternative paths of femininity. The image of femininity as created by the publishing and media industry was strong, as Friedan recounts, "It feeds on the very facts which might contradict it, and seeps into every corner of the culture."[64] To write about women in the 50s was to write about housewife culture, which was not a restriction O'Connor was willing to accept.

What makes O'Connor's engagement with gender roles intriguing is the lack of concrete answers or alternate

---

[63] Prown, 40.
[64] Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 47.

solutions. O'Connor's female characters neither wholly support traditional gender roles nor completely defy them, and any female character that either adheres too closely or pushes too far is punished by the narrative. O'Connor's desire to be seen as a serious author may have dissuaded her from including more female perspectives and experiences, but what she does include shows an uncertainty and dissatisfaction with strictly defined gender expectations for women. O'Connor critiques gender norms of her day as much as Friedan does by portraying a variety of female characters, few of which are ideal suburban housewives. This repressive patriarchal system of the 1950s can be seen in O'Connor's female characters, as they try to either enact or break gender expectations. By including a range of responses to the patriarchal system, O'Connor responds to gender issues of her day while still devoting the majority of the narrative to themes of spiritualism and faith.

Works Cited

Donahoo, Robert. "O'Connor and *The Feminine Mystique*: "The Limitations That Reality Imposed."" In *"On the subject of the feminist business": Re-Reading Flannery O'Connor*, edited by Teresa Caruso and Peter Lang, 9–28. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004.

Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. Norton Critical Edition, edited by Kristen Fermaglich and Lisa M. Fine. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991.

Miller, Monica Carol. *Being Ugly: Southern Women Writers and Social Rebellion.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2017.

O'Connor, Flannery. "A Circle in the Fire." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 232–251. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Good Country People." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 263–284. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "A Good Man Is Hard to Find." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 137–153. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Greenleaf." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 501–524. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "The Life You Save May Be Your Own." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 172–183. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To A. 30 September 1955." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 958–961. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To A. 10 November 1955." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 1125–1126. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To A. 28 June 1956." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 997–998. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To A. 17 November 1956." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 1004–1009. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To Sally and Robert Fitzgerald 10 June 1955." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 939–940. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To John Hawkes 14 April 1960." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 967–969. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Letter To Robert Lowell 2 May 1952." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 896–897. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "Revelation." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 633–654. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

---. "A Stroke of Good Fortune." In *Flannery O'Connor: Collected Works*, edited by Sally Fitzgerald, 184–196. New York: The Library of America, 1988.

Prown, Katherine Hemple. *Revising Flannery O'Connor: Southern Literary Culture and the Problem of Female Authorship.* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.

Wilson, Aimee Armande. "Southern Mother, Lethal Fetus; Or, How Birth Control Makes a Modernist out of Flannery O'Connor." *Genre*, 47, no. 3 (2014): 407–430.

Wilson, Natalie. "Misfit Bodies and Errant Gender: The Corporeal Feminism of Flannery O'Connor." In *"On the subject of the feminist business": Re-Reading Flannery O'Connor*, edited by Teresa Caruso and Peter Lang, 94–119. New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 2004.

MAD WOMAN IN *THE BELL JAR*:
ESTHER'S STRUGGLE FOR LITERARY AUTHENTICITY WITHIN THE PATRIARCHAL NARRATIVE

Courtney Kratz

Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar* relates the tragic coming of age story of a young woman named Esther who aspires to write in a culture where female literary ambition is stifled by patriarchy. Plath writes semi-autobiographically through her literary alter ego, Esther. For both women, writing establishes agency, transmuting suffering into art as public testimony, which allows them to "rebel against the values and practices of a dominant culture and to assume an empowered position of political agency in the world."[1] This rebellion takes place in a patriarchal society, however, and more specifically, a historically patriarchal literary canon. In *The Madwoman in the Attic*, feminist theorists Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar complicate literary critic Harold Bloom's Freudian theory of literary genealogy. Bloom suggests that the artist has an "anxiety of influence," a feeling that he is not a creator and that his predecessors assume priority over his work; it is an Oedipal struggle between authorial "father" and "son" that Gilbert and Gubar point out is "intensely (and

[1] Annette M. Krizanich, "The Pen is Mightier than the Dominant Discourse: Writing as Agency and Healing in Plath, Gordon, Frame, Marmon Silko, and Hogan." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 17.3 (2015): 397.

even exclusively) male."[2] Gilbert and Gubar complicate Bloom's theory by providing a feminist counterpoint: rather than "anxiety of influence," they argue, the female artist experiences an "anxiety of authorship—a radical fear that she cannot create, that because she can never become a 'precursor' the act of writing will isolate or destroy her." This anxiety is then exacerbated by the seemingly insurmountable authority of male precursors and their relegation of the female body to that of the muse. Though Gilbert and Gubar present this anxiety as unique to female authors in the 19th century, "anxiety is of authorship" is palpable in 20th century works such as *The Bell Jar.* Plath's life and novel articulate this struggle for female literary authority. Path shows how claiming one's voice through narration is important for women writing against patriarchal socialization, which makes it doubly damaging when women are excluded from written forms of expression. Esther, for example, struggles to find narratives that articulate the female experience or female precursors who prove it is possible to do so. As a result, Esther is alienated from the language that gives her expression. She loses authorship over her life as if she were a female character in a male-authored novel, playing at hegemonic social scripts that usher her towards stifling, domestic destiny. The effects of this domination and its protest are present in the text of Esther's body, the locos of domination and rebellion. Tragically, what Gilbert and Gubar propose as a Victorian concept is present in *The Bell Jar*, and both its protagonist and its author are driven to suicide as a way to reclaim female authorship over body and narrative.

Esther strives to find agency through writing despite the fact that she does so in a culture dominated by patriarchal narrative. Unlike her male counterpart, the female writer

---

[2] Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar. "Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the Anxiety of Authorship." *Feminist Theory and Criticism*, ed. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007), 450.

"must first struggle against the effects of a socialization which makes conflict with the will of her (male) precursors seem inexpressibly absurd, futile, or even...self-annihilating."[3] Such struggle is exemplified by the challenges Esther faces to become a writer. When she fails to gain admission to her desired writing course, she considers taking other English classes until she realizes that the course prerequisite is in the eighteenth century. Esther says, "I hated the very idea of the eighteenth century, with all those smug men writing tight little couplets and being so dead keen on reason."[4] The prospect of studying exclusively male writers sickens Esther, so she abandons her plan to take summer English courses. Later, when her boyfriend Buddy Willard tells her that a poem is just "a piece of dust," she cannot respond in the moment to refute his assertion.[5] Instead, she answers with a characteristic "I guess so" and imagines her rebuttal later. She admits that she often takes what Buddy says as the "honest-to-God truth" and is thus frustrated when he demeans the value of literature. He unwittingly plays into the patriarchal presumption that he can participate in Esther's literary world without struggling to perfect his craft as she has. In fact, he hardly seems to recognize that it would be a struggle at all, and he is proud of his published but poorly written poem. Buddy illustrates how literary authority is easily imagined as masculine, and he fails to take Esther's feminine literary authority seriously, particularly by presuming he can write poetry without formal training. Such moments illustrate the stifling and patriarchal social milieu in which both Plath and Esther struggle to establish their authorial voice.

In addition to the struggle of establishing her literary authority, Esther struggles to find literature that articulates

---

[3] Gilbert and Gubar, 451.

[4] Sylvia Plath, *The Bell Jar* (New York: Harper Collins, 1971), 124.

[5] Sylvia Plath, *The Bell Jar*, 56.

her female experience. The narratives Esther encounters are more like the technicolor "football romance" she views with her friend Betsy.[6] She describes the film as a predictable imitation of other narratives, with heroines/actresses who appear to be imitations of other actresses. Esther describes the movie as "poor," and when it becomes clear that the "nice girl" and the "nice football star" would end up together, she begins to feel "peculiar." She looks around at a slack-jawed audience of "stupid moonbrains" and leaves the theater.[7] Esther ultimately tires of interchangeable, indistinguishable "heroines" who can only star in the love story.[8] Even professional trajectories for English majors, according to Esther's mother, end in marriage. Esther's mother tells her that no one wants a plain English major but that everyone would want an English major who knew shorthand.[9] Plath writes, "Everybody would want her. She would be in demand among all the up-and-coming young men and she would transcribe letter after thrilling letter." Here, Esther's mother implies that the best use of Esther's English major is in the service of men, a service that would better position Esther to find a husband. Esther retorts, "The trouble was, I hated the idea of serving men in any way. I wanted to dictate my own thrilling letters..." Such an exchange demonstrates that fictional narratives such as the "football romance" are accepted as social reality. Yet even as a formally trained writer, Esther struggles to verbally articulate her female experience to people in her life. When she tells Buddy Willard she never plans to marry and why, his response is dismissive: "You're crazy. You'll change

---

[6] Sylvia Plath, *The Bell Jar*, 42

[7] Plath, 43.

[8] Joanna Russ, "What Can a Heroine Do? Or Why Women Can't Write." *Feminist Theory and Criticism*, ed. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007), 203.

[9] Plath, 7.

your mind."[10] Buddy also tells her that her mental and physical ailments are psychosomatic,[11] and Dr. Gordon later echoes this kind of dismissiveness when he says, "Suppose you try and tell me what you think is wrong."[12] Esther justifiably responds, "What did I *think* was wrong? That made it sound as if nothing was really wrong, I only *thought* it was wrong." Though she still tries to articulate her thoughts and experiences to Buddy and Dr. Gordon, their patriarchal authority overrides her narrative with a narrative of their own: that her experience as she describes it is inaccurate or psychosomatic. These dismissals are demoralizing for Esther, who comments on an article she reads about marriage that "the one thing [it] didn't seem to me to consider is how the girl felt."[13] Esther is thus surrounded on all sides by patriarchal narrative in fiction, social reality, nonfiction, and even her own verbal expression.

Esther vainly attempts to seek solace in female literary figures as an alternative. But "anxiety of authorship" is inevitably passed down, and much of her "literary matrilineage" does not exist in the way patrilineage does.[14] A literary precursor would "prove by example that a revolt against patriarchal literary authority is possible." Thus, Gilbert and Gubar argue, a female author searches for a female model "not because she wants dutifully to comply with male definitions of 'femininity' but because she must legitimize her own rebellious endeavors."[15] Despite their importance, Esther lacks female role models for much of the novel. Mrs. Willard, for example, comes close as someone who once taught at a private school and married a university professor, but to Esther, she represents the "kitchen mat" role of women

---

[10] Plath, 93.
[11] Plath, 87.
[12] Plath, 29.
[13] Plath, 81.
[14] Gilbert and Gubar, *Anxiety of Authorship*, 453-454.
[15] Gilbert and Gubar, 452.

in domesticity, where all she does is "cook and clean and wash."[16] Esther's own mother, too, betrays her intelligence by teaching shorthand, and Esther comes to hate her despite what she has done to keep them afloat financially. Esther fails to find a model even at Smith College, where being a scholarship student regarded as an "experiment" of the dean cannot make up for the fact that the institution is just as performative as the word she thought she left behind. Esther's peers regard her as abnormal for devoting herself to her work; she can only find solace when she visibly confirms her femininity by dating Buddy Willard. The social capital of being "practically engaged" and Buddy's convenient diagnosis with tuberculosis are what permit Esther solitude; her relationship to an absent boyfriend give her the appearance of heteronormativity. After college, Esther finds a potential model in Jay Cee, who oversees Esther's magazine internship, and Esther admits that she "wished she had a mother like Jay Cee."[17] Jay Cee runs a magazine that is mostly fashion and short articles, however, making her written legacy part of performative, artificial femininity within patriarchal culture. Ultimately, the closest Esther comes to a mentor is Philomena Guinea, a wealthy novelist whom Esther's scholarship is named after. Esther "had read one of Mrs. Guinea's books in the town library—the college library didn't stock them for some reason—" and finds it "crammed full" of predictable, suspenseful questions about the characters' love lives and their relationships with men.[18] Not only does Esther find that her university does not regard her precursor highly enough to carry her novels, but she also discovers that even Philomena Guinea has not escaped narrative dominance of patriarchy, which leaves few plots to women aside from love stories. Esther is thus disappointed by the literary role models

[16] Plath, 84.

[17] Plath, 39.

[18] Plath, 41.

in her life and asks, "Why did I attract these weird old women? ...[T]hey all wanted to adopt me in some way, and, for the price of their care and influence, have me resemble them."[19] Esther sees that the continued "anxiety of authorship" and struggle against feminine socialization would be passed onto her, and instead she tries to create her own models of false, performative selves made out of sanctioned cultural images. But personas like her pseudonym Elly Higginbottom are two-dimensional and leave Esther wanting to "crawl into" other women, such as a Russian interpreter, so she can habit alternative realities. This, too, fails, and Esther fails to situate herself in society because she is unable to find a feminine role model who has escaped the patriarchy's hegemonic narratives.

Esther's tenuous conviction of her own literary authority is rendered artificial at her *Ladies' Day* photoshoot, where the women will be photographed "with props to show what we wanted to be."[20] Esther is photographed as a poet and given a fake rose to pose with. A grotesque artifice overtakes the scene, as Esther looks through "a frieze of rubber plants" in the window, where "a few stagey cloud puffs were travelling from right to left" in the sky. The photographer says, "Show us how happy it makes you to write a poem," and Esther feels committed not to smile, to maintain her seriousness, until at the photographer's insistence, she "obediently, like the mouth of a ventriloquist dummy," begins to smile and burst into tears.[21] Esther's genuine emotion breaks the scene, and the photographer and Jay Cee vanish. Esther is left feeling "limp and betrayed, like the skin shed by a terrible animal, but it seemed to have taken my spirit with it, and everything else it could lay its paws on." This is a poignant scene in which Esther's authentic desire and competence as a

[19] Plath, 73.
[20] Plath, 91.
[21] Plath, 92.

poet are rendered meaningless and commodified by the theatrics of the photoshoot. Gilbert and Gubar write that women are more often depicted as the muse than as the author; both sexes learn that as part of a woman's subjugation, she becomes representative of nature, sexuality, and the chaotic, spontaneous, intuitive male creativity she inspires.[22] In the artifice of the photograph, Esther's claim to being a poet is made performative. She becomes the muse, a complying marionette meant to sit on the shelf and inspire. In this way, the image of Esther as an author, which she models in the fashion magazine, undermines the authenticity of her literary authority. It is not the actual Esther, but the cliché image. She has become "no more than a cipher in the...mass-circulation magazine, plucked momentarily out of anonymity to be invested with the fraudulent charisma of 'celebrity' whose image then returns to its place or origin divested and purified of circumstantial history."[23] This is the culminating moment of Esther's internship, one in which she is stripped of the literary authority she struggles to maintain, left only with the artifice of her gender performance and the authenticity of her depression.

Esther's breakdown at the photoshoot and the emotional trauma of her internship leave her feeling alienated from language. She cannot take English courses because she does not want to study eighteenth century men, and she despises the idea of taking shorthand in the service of male dictators. Though she resolves to write a thesis on *Finnegan's Wake*, "the white chalk curlicues blurred into senselessness.[24] Words twist like "faces in a funhouse mirror" and grow

---

[22] Gilbert and Gubar, 450-451.

[23] Stan Smith. "Attitudes Counterfeiting Life: The Irony of Artifice in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*." *Critical Quarterly* 17.3 (1975), 257.

[24] Plath, 122.

"barbs and rams' horns" to the point of becoming "untranslatable." They being to "jiggle up and down in a silly way" on the page, and the lines of her letter to Doreen "sloped down the page from left to right almost diagonally, as if they were loops of string lying on the paper, and someone had come along and blown them askew."[25] This is partly instigated by Esther's rejection from the writing course. In her own life, after getting rejected from Frank O'Connor's writing class at Harvard, Plath wrote the following in a letter: "I was sterile, empty, unlived, unwise and unread. And the more I tried to remedy the situation, the more I became unable to comprehend one word of our fair old language."[26] This alienation from language, for Esther and likely for Plath, comes from being rejected as a writer and feeling like her authenticity as a poet has been put on display and violated. Being a writer is an intrinsic part of Esther's identity, which is "bound up in language, [since] …her psyche expresses itself as a text and as a desire to compare text."[27] Esther's alienation from language thus comes from her anxiety of authorship, exacerbated by rejection from (an illustrious man's) writing course and the cheapening of her identity as a poet.

In addition to worsening her anxiety of authorship, Esther's breakdown signifies the silencing of her voice, linguistic capacity, and means of articulating and understanding her female experience. While in New York, Esther writes, "The silence depressed me. It wasn't the silence of silence. It was my own silence."[28] She describes herself as feeling like a "dirty-scrawled-over letter," as if a more dominant narrative has written over her experience and that she has let it. Gilbert and Gubar write, "Rejecting the poisoned apples her culture

---

[25] Plath, 130.

[26] Marilyn Boyer, "The Disabled Female Body as a Metaphor for Language in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar*," *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 33, no. 2 (Mar. 2004): 214.

[27] Boyer, "The Disabled Female Body," 220.

[28] Plath, 18.

offers her, the woman writer often becomes in some sense anorexic, resolutely closing her mouth in silence."[29] Esther, in response to repeated challenges to her authorship, becomes silent. Part of her silence, particularly toward the other women in her internship and to Buddy Willard, is due to her marginalized status as both a working-class woman in a wealthhy environment and as a woman in a heterosexual relationship.[30] While in New York, Esther's friend Doreen returns from an outing with a man and vomits in Esther's room, much like Esther does after a lavish Ladies' Day dinner and heteronormative technicolor film. Krizanich writes, "Instead of speaking words, these women can only regurgitate garbage. Neither Esther nor Doreen has a voice."[31] The poisoned female body becomes analogous to "stilled language," for neither woman has found her voice, yet others fill them with repressed discourse.[32] This lack of voice, a voice that has been written over, drives Esther to silence. Psychoanalytic feminist philosopher Kelly Oliver writes that depressed, marginalized individuals, such as an ambitious, intellectual female writer in the 1950's, "are reduced to silence because they have given up on words to express the painful affects..." of losing the "authentic self."[33] Oliver writes, "With depression, the split between words and affects can become so extreme that it leads to catatonia and even suicide." Esther's depression and silence ultimately derive from her "anxiety of authorship," which silences her authentic self.

Without words to express her experience, Esther begins to view herself outside of her body, often through the

---

[29] Gilbert and Gubar, 458.
[30] Krizanich, "Writing as Agency," 402.
[31] Krizanich, 403.
[32] Boyer, "The Disabled Female Body," 203.
[33] Kelly Oliver, "The Depressed Sex," *Colonization of Psychic Space* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004), 123.

male gaze. Kelly Oliver writes that the silence of marginalization "constitutes the identity of depressed women…[it] results in a sense of double or debilitating alienation from one's own experience that is directly related to one's social context and position as marginalized or excluded within mainstream culture."[34] As a depressed woman, Esther feels "flawed or defective in [her] very being."[35] Her hatred is directed inward rather than outward at the society that shames her. Esther writes at the very beginning of the novel, "I knew something was wrong with me that summer…I was supposed to be having the time of my life…"[36] Esther concerned about she is "supposed" to feel and instead she feels shame for being sickened by children, her own culturally sanctioned biological imperative. She "started adding up all the things [she] couldn't do," such as cook or perform other domestic tasks, and her shame is ultimately damaging to her agency.[37] Oliver writes, "Domination infects those oppressed with the punishing superego that excludes and abjects them…[it] creates a sense of double alienation…commands self-destruction and undermines that seat of agency."[38] Both Oliver and Susan Bordo write that this sense of shame is opposed to autonomy and renders a subject unable to make effective change in their life.[39,40] Esther writes that she "wasn't steering anything, not even [herself]," that she moved along like a "numb trolleybus" or a character in someone else's fiction.[41] The normative force of society and the influence of its patriarchal

---

[34] Kelly Oliver, "The Depressed Sex," 112.
[35] Oliver, 105.
[36] Plath, 2.
[37] Plath, 75.
[38] Oliver, 105.
[39] Oliver, 113.
[40] Susan Bordo, "The Body and the Reproduction of Femininity." *Feminist Theory and Criticism*, ed. Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar (New York: W. W. Norton, 2007), 745.
[41] Plath, 2-3.

gender norms put Esther in a paralyzing position of shame and self-perceived abnormality. When she returns home from New York, the telephone becomes a "puppet string that can be tugged to call her to attention and performance."[42] She speaks in a hollow, "zombie" voice with its own imperious autonomy, cancelling her desire to attend summer school. As Smith points out, Esther "comes up against the glass of the bell jar, as if some external narrator, who had just spoken through her, had also prescribed the limits of her freedom." Esther writes, "My hand advanced a few inches, then retreated and fell limp. I forced it towards the receiver again, but again it stopped short, as if I had collided with a pane of glass."[43] In revolt, Esther resolves to write a novel about her literary persona Elaine, but she can do little but transcribe her own experience of socially imposed ennui. Smith suggests that Esther "cannot progress, and no doubt if she could, she would set up an infinite regress of heroines writing about heroines," a depressing rendition of absent female precursors.[44] When her mother urges Esther to get dressed, Esther responds that she lacks the time; she is busy with her novel, but she cannot move when she hears her mother put away her typewriter in preparation for supper.[45] Like Elaine, Esther feels herself to be the "puppet of powers she cannot comprehend, as if she too were a character in a novel," much like Esther is for Plath.[46] Esther's true author, however, is "a whole matrix of social forces, of conventions and norms" that reinforce Esther's sense of shame and lack of agency.

Esther feels like a character in a novel written by a man because she exists in a society coded by men, and the literary narratives available to her do not articulate her female experience. Radical feminist Joanna Russ writes, "The

---

[42] Smith, "Irony of Artifice," 252.
[43] Plath, 125.
[44] Smith, "Irony of Artifice," 254.
[45] Plath, 130.
[46] Smith, 255.

lack…of acceptable dramatizations of what our experience means, harms much more than art itself…[Women] interpret our own experiences in terms of them…[and] perceive what happens to us in the mythic terms our culture provides."[47] The traditional plots afforded to women often teach them that to mature is to live up to the social expectations of one's gender role, and Esther is suffocating under these pressures. Like Gilbert and Gubar, literary theorist Jean Kennard writes about Victorian narrative tropes that hold unfortunate sway over the world in which Plath wrote. Kennard points out that the female coming of age novel ends with marriage, where the young protagonist grows out of her adolescent idealism or rebelliousness and into the reality of correct social values.[48] Kennard writes, "[S]ince in order to reach maturity the heroine must accept certain values and since the repository of these values is the 'right' suitor, at the end of the novel the heroine inevitably appears to have subordinated her own personality to that of the hero." Due to the lack of narratives articulating Esther's experience—and the abundance of narratives subordinating women to their romantic suitors—Esther experiences what Kelly Oliver calls "social melancholy," in this case resulting from the "unavailability of positive representations of [womanhood]."[49] Because Esther's mainstream culture provides "only abject images of the self," the resulting malaise causes Esther to lose her "lovable self" and positive self-image.[50]

Since available articulations of the female experience—at least those available to Esther—all revolve around romantic relationships and woman's domestic destiny, and since Esther has refused the possibility of marriage and what it represents, she is left with nothing. She writes blankly, "I

---

[47] Russ, "Why Women Can't Write," 209.
[48] Jean E. Kennard, "Victims of Convention," *Pacific Coast Philology*, vol. 8 (1973), 24.
[49] Oliver, 110.
[50] Plath, 115.

had nothing to look forward to."[51] Even in her own writing, Esther cannot escape the love story. She cannot give Elaine a narrative other than the suburban ennui that spurs Esther to write because she does not believe she has the necessary experience. Esther asks herself, "How could I write about life when I'd never had a love affair or a baby or even seen anybody die?"[52] Esther views the narrative potential of her life, and the lives of her characters, as inscribed by the dominant, patriarchal narratives of mid-century America. With her friend Doreen, who Esther views as a more conventional, attractive protagonist, Esther marginalizes herself as a side character. In the company of Doreen and her male friend Lenny, Esther feels "gawky and morbid as somebody in a slide show."[53] Esther laments her height and appearance, describing Doreen's romantic entanglements in the spotlight rather than her own. She pushes her body, both physically and verbally, to the periphery, and she describes Doreen "with her white hair and white dress" reflecting the "neon lights over the bar" as if she is center stage. Esther encounters the woman-hater, Marco, as a woman would encounter the "wrong suitor" in a marriage plot. She begins the encounter, as usual, narrating Doreen, but when she betrays her interest in the diamond stickpin that Marco gives her, she is compromised. Smith writes, "Marco's attentions are dehumanizing and reductive, and the glass of the bell jar does not protect [Esther] from his thinly veiled malevolence."[54] Esther compares Marco to an aggressive snake, and he "assumes proprietorial, authorial power over her," and makes her dance "without any will or knowledge of her own."[55] Like the end of a marriage plot, Esther has been engulfed by the overpowering masculinity of Marco, and she almost lets him succeed

---

[51] Plath, 117.
[52] Plath, 121.
[53] Plath, 25.
[54] Smith, 253.
[55] Plath, 108.

when he attempts to rape her. Later, she seems to fall into the trap of the marriage plot when she loses her virginity. She feels "part of a great tradition," though Marilyn Boyer wonders whether the tradition is of sex or of sexual abuse.[56] Esther writes that she experiences a feeling of belonging to "the stories of blood-stained bridal sheets and capsules of red ink bestowed on already deflowered brides" after she has sex with Irwin and hemorrhages.[57] It seems that Esther does not want to be engulfed by Marco, Buddy, or Irwin, but she cannot author her own experience and instead interprets her interactions in relation to patriarchal literature, thus relegating herself to the singular representations of women available to her.

The internalization of this male, authorial perspective overwrites Esther's authentic, lovable self on her own body. Esther becomes Foucault's "docile body" regulated by cultural norms.[58] Her depression can be read as a pathology of embodied protest, a way of communicating dissatisfaction. Gilbert and Gubar write that patriarchal socialization "literally makes women sick, both physically and mentally."[59] This is visible on Esther's body, a medium and metaphor for culture where culture is inscribed and reinforced "through the concrete language of the body."[60] For Esther, her body is both the text of patriarchal socialization and the locus of her rebellion. Krizanich argues that Buddy "teaches" Esther to ski as punishment for her refusal to marry him. He tells her that she was doing fine until a man stepped in her way, which "could be the theme of the entire book, as the patriarchy repeatedly wounds Esther and takes away her voice."[61] Krizanich argues that Buddy exhibits a "queer, satisfied smile"

---

[56] Boyer, 219.
[57] Plath, 229.
[58] Susan Bordo, "Reproduction of Femininity," 745.
[59] Gilbert and Gubar, 451.
[60] Bordo, 754.
[61] Krizanich, "Writing as Agency," 422.

because he has written his revenge on Esther's body, knowing that she would passively accept his instructions and fail. Esther interprets this encounter as textual, seeing Buddy in front of "black dots" swarming on "a plane of whiteness" like the printed word.[62] In a similar way, she lets the blood Marco wipes on her after the assault remain on her face, interpreting it as a metaphor for her experience.[63] Krizanich writes, "It is in some ways a mark of victory for her; it is her trophy as a survivor. Yet, it is also the mark of how he has wounded her psychologically, much more deeply than Buddy has."[64] After the attack, Esther returns home to work on a novel about her life and find her voice, yet she gives up because she thinks she lacks "experience," showing that she chooses to stay silent about those experiences that have traumatized her. After Dr. Gordon's violently painful electroshock therapy, which leaves her feeling "dumb and subdued," Esther goes home and cuts herself with Gillette blades.[65] She experiences "a small, deep thrill...The blood gathered darkly...and rolled down [her] ankle into the cup of [her] patent leather shoe" like ink on paper. Krizanich writes, "In a perverse way, [Esther] is trying to take control of language. Instead of letting men mark her, she desires to write her own already victimized body into annihilation."[66] Esther is frustrated by her body's weakness, by how she fears the cold water of the ocean or the continued beat of her heart. She decides she will have to "ambush" her body, or it will "trap me in its stupid cage for fifty years without any sense at all."[67] Esther thus declares war "on the very body that men have been writing their script upon."[68]

---

[62] Plath, 98.
[63] Boyer, 210.
[64] Krizanich, 402.
[65] Plath, 145.
[66] Krizanich, 404.
[67] Plath, 149.
[68] Krizanich, 404.

This pathological protest and war on her own body lead Esther to the conclusion that the best way to overcome "anxiety of authorship" and end men's image of her, the image she cannot escape, is to commit suicide: the ultimate act of authorship. As a woman in a societal text authored by men, Esther feels "wrinkled" in pages that "perpetually tell her how she seems."[69] Gilbert and Gubar argue that the female writer's battle "is not against her (male) precursors' reading of the world but against his reading of *her*."[70] Esther must "redefine the terms of her socialization,"[71] even if the protest is ultimately "counterproductive, tragically self-defeating (indeed, self-deconstructing."[72] Smith writes, "Esther sees suicide not so much as self-destruction as a theatrical ritual which will free her from her 'factitious' identity and restore her to singularity. It is her 'image' that she wishes to murder, the fraudulent twin which is her public persona."[73] On suicide, Esther writes:

> But when it came right down to it, the skin of my wrist looked so white and defenseless that I couldn't do it. It was as if what I wanted to kill wasn't in that skin or the thin blue pulse that jumped under my thumb, but somewhere else, deeper, more secret, and a whole lot harder to get at... I moved in front of the medicine cabinet. If I looked in the mirror while I did it, it would be like watching somebody else, in a book or a play.[74]

Esther cannot reach the part of herself that she wants to kill because it was authored by men: she has no authority over

---

[69] Gilbert and Gubar, 454.
[70] Gilbert and Gubar, 452.
[71] Gilbert and Gubar, 452.
[72] Bordo, 753.
[73] Smith, 258.
[74] Plath, 147.

that image, but she recognizes that her feminine body, her skin, is not it. Her body is something men have colonized and written upon, something they have attempted to define, but it exists independently, autonomously even, of their definition. Though Esther still views suicide like a spectator of her own body, her double alienation and critical superego that incites her shame are effects of patriarchy and the lack of narratives representing the female experience. When Esther reads the narrative of her own suicide attempt in the newspaper, she reads in the third person, an omniscient narrator reading about the "missing scholarship girl."[75] The great irony of Esther's suicide narrative, driven by lack of autonomous female narratives, is that she has created one, one that inadvertently makes her a precursor for Joan Gilling, Esther's companion in the mental hospital who also attended Smith College and dated Buddy Willard. The repeated failure of Esther's matrilineal role models to escape patriarchal narrative hegemony is a tragedy put in stark relief by the fact that it creates a narrative representation for women like Joan. Though self-destructing, it expresses the ultimate dissatisfaction and protest of a shared female experience.

Joanna Russ writes that "culture is male" and that "[o]ur literary myths are for heroes, not heroines."[76] The mid-century society in which Esther exists is thus authored for men, by men. While Gilbert and Gubar attribute "anxiety of authorship" to Victorian female writers, it is a clear instigator of both Esther and Sylvia Plath's depression more than a hundred years later, and this depression has tragic consequences. Esther's conscious and unconscious protest to patriarchal paradigms is at the self-destructive expense of her own female body. In some ways, this is Esther's way of escaping her socially constructed identity by setting her own terms. Bordo writes, "[M]uteness is the condition of the silent, un-

---

[75] Plath, 198.
[76] Russ, 203.

complaining woman—an ideal of patriarchal culture. Protesting the stifling of the female voice through one's own voicelessness—that is, employing the language of femininity to protest the conditions of the female world—will always involve ambiguities of this sort."[77] Esther's tragic means of protest are not particular to her, as she discovers that her mentor, Philomena Guinea, was also institutionalized at the peak of her literary career, as is Esther's friend Joan. Kelly Oliver attributes this kind of self-destructive protest and loss of the lovable self to the lack of "positive images of women that are not always tinged with abjection," without which it is "difficult to avoid depression."[78] Given the autobiographical nature of the *The Bell Jar*, it seems that both Plath and Esther sought authenticity to escape the performative artifice patriarchy required of them. Though the book ends on a note of Esther's hopeful recovery, Plath ended her own life shortly after the book was published. Krizanich writes, "Perhaps the fact that Esther is allowed release from the institution only after she has internalized the dominant discourse of the patriarchy contributed to the work's failure to heal its author."[79] Yet despite Plath's tragic death, and the implication that Esther may be destined for the same, much of their social melancholy stems from, as Oliver points out, a lack of narratives accurately expressing the female experience. Though it could not save its author from "anxiety of authorship" and patriarchal socialization, Plath's novel is well-positioned to express this struggle. Perhaps *The Bell Jar*, then, is the articulation that establishes Plath as the much needed matrilineal precursor for future female writers.

---

[77] Bordo, S753.
[78] Oliver, 122.
[79] Krizanich, 401.

Works Cited

Bordo, Susan. "The Body and the Reproduction of Femininity." *Feminist Theory and Criticism.* Edited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

Boyer, Marilyn. "The Disabled Female Body as a Metaphor for Language in Sylvia Plath's The Bell Jar." *Women's Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, vol. 33, no. 2 (Mar. 2004).

Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. "Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the Anxiety of Authorship." *Feminist Theory and Criticism.* Edited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

Kennard, Jean E. "Victims of Convention." *Pacific Coast Philology* 8 (1973): 23-27. doi:10.2307/1316734.

Krizanich, Annette M. "The Pen is Mightier than the Dominant Discourse: Writing as Agency and Healing in Plath, Gordon, Frame, Marmon Silko, and Hogan." *Interdisciplinary Literary Studies* 17.3 (2015).

Oliver, Kelly. "The Depressed Sex." *Colonization of Psychic Space.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004.

Plath, Sylvia. *The Bell Jar.* New York: Harper Collins, 1971.

Russ, Joanna. "What Can a Heroine Do? Or Why Women Can't Write." *Feminist Theory and Criticism.* Edited by Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar. New York: W. W. Norton, 2007.

Smith, Stan. "Attitudes Counterfeiting Life: The Irony of Artifice in Sylvia Plath's *The Bell Jar.*" *Critical Quarterly* 17.3 (1975).

BREACHING THE IRON CURTAIN:

LOUIS ARMSTRONG, CULTURAL VICTORY, AND COLD WAR AMBASSADORSHIP

Everyone is familiar with hard power. We know that military and economic might often get others to change their position...But sometimes you can get the outcomes you want without tangible threats or payoffs...This soft power—getting others to want the outcomes that you want—co-opts people rather than coerces them...[It] rests on the ability to shape the preferences of others.[1]

Quincy Mix

Analyses of the Cold War tend to dwell almost solely on its hard power dynamics. Arms treaties, military invasions, supply blockades—these often receive most of, if not all, the attention in academic discourse. Yet, as political scientist Joseph Nye, Jr., makes abundantly clear, "[t]he Cold War was won by a mixture of hard *and* soft power," with the latter manifested in a wide array of U.S. cultural exports to the Eastern Bloc and the Third World.[2] As a number of scholars have demonstrated,[3] jazz rose to preeminence in the

---

[1] Jospeh S. Nye, Jr., *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (New York: Public Affairs, 2004), 5.

[2] Ibid., 50 (emphasis added).

[3] See Lisa E. Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy: Promoting America in the Cold War Era* (Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009); Penny M. Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), accessed Apr 8, 2018, ProQuest Ebook Central; Danielle Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015), EBSCOhost eBook Collection.

U.S. "arsenal of cultural weapons" throughout the 1950s and 1960s. With its lively, "democratic" rhythms and distinctly African-American flair, jazz performance could serve both as a contrast to Communism's repressive ideology and as a means of deflecting Communist criticism over the racism of the Jim-Crow South.[4] Out of a plethora of U.S. musical legends and icons tapped for the propaganda initiative, Louis ("Satchmo") Armstrong emerged as America's foremost "Jazz Ambassador" during this period. Of special importance in the rich history of "jazz diplomacy" was Armstrong's widely-celebrated concert tour behind the Iron Curtain in the spring of 1965—a groundbreaking trip that saw Armstrong become the first major U.S. entertainer to perform in Communist East Germany. Further analysis of the lead-up to, and the outcomes of, Armstrong's "All Stars" trip corroborates American jazz historian Daniel Stein's designation of the tour as a "central moment" in the Cold War era.[5] At a time when political-military relations between the West and the Soviet Bloc had reached a new nadir, the "All Stars" tour demonstrated soft power's unique ability to erode rigid ideological barriers one song at a time. More than any other event prior to or following it, the tour testified to the magnetism of melody and the pull of persona, bringing about—in no uncertain terms—the crescendo of America's hard-won battle for the hearts and minds of the communist oppressed. More than this, however, the Soviet Bloc tour demonstrated Armstrong's personal and political maturation into the consummate "Goodwill Ambassador" for American values. There,

---

[4] Frances S. Saunders, *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters* (New York: The New York Press, 1999), 2.

[5] Daniel Stein, "Onkel Satchmo Behind the Iron Curtain: The Transatlantic Politics of Louis Armstrong's Visit to East Germany," *Americana: The Journal of American Popular Culture*, vol. 13, no. 1 (2014): n.p., accessed April 3, 2018, http://www.americanpopularculture.com/journal/articles/spring_2014/stein.htm.

he fully came into his own as a decorous yet authentic diplomat, one who—by his infrequent, yet poignant protests of America's racial injustices—embodied and championed democratic freedoms before an "unfree" world.[6]

I. Prelude to Cultural Victory: The CPP, "Ambassador Satch," and Jazz in the Eastern Bloc

To comprehend the significance of Armstrong's pivotal journey behind the Iron Curtain, it is imperative to underscore the diplomatic and cultural forces that made the occasion possible—not just in the United States but also within the Communist states of the Eastern Bloc. Though the All Stars contracted this particular trip in 1965 without official U.S. sponsorship (or approval—at least with respect to the band's performances in East Germany), their tour nevertheless built upon the precedents and political assumptions set down by the U.S. Department of State's Cultural Presentations Program (CPP) during the 1950s.[7] With the mass de-colonization movements of Africa and East Asia in full swing by 1954, President Dwight Eisenhower sought to gain the upper hand in the arena of Cold War "spheres of influence" by projecting America's cultural and political liberties onto the world stage—literally. Thus, in 1956, Eisenhower secured $5 million in emergency appropriations to form the President's Special International Program—later rebranded the CPP—as a performance vehicle for securing new "converts to 'the

---

[6] Ibid.

[7] "U.S. Regrets Satchmo Plays in East Berlin," *The Atlanta Constitution* (1946-1984), Mar 20, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1557811001?accountid=11012. Since the United States did not officially recognize the German Democratic Republic (GDR), American officials stated "they would prefer Armstrong and other Americans not to recognize it either"; Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 35.

American way of life.'"[8] Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, the initiative's primary steward, originally developed the program as a partnership between the State Department and the American National Theatre and Academy (ANTA), sending abroad hundreds of classical orchestras, theatre troupes, and ballet companies with the assistance of corporate sponsors.[9]

Increasingly, however, the State Department began to reorient its focus around the promotion of American jazz—an initiative long promoted by civil rights activists, U.S. congressmen like Rep. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr., and eminent jazz scholars like Marshall Stearns and John S. Wilson.[10] Whether performed live or broadcast to the world via radio propaganda shows like Willis Conover's *Voice of America*, jazz would offer, in Conover's words, "a musical reflection of the way things happen in America": its innovative, freestyle rhythms and infectious melodies would symbolize a free America's marked contrast to the tyranny and

---

[8] John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2005), 20; Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 4-6, 7.

[9] Ibid., 6, 39; Dana Gioia, "Cool Jazz and Cold War: Dana Gioia, Chairman of National Endowment for the Arts, Talks with Jazz Legend Dave Brubeck about Diplomacy in 5/4 Time," *The American Interest*, vol. 1, no. 3 (2006): n.p., accessed Apr 3, 2018, https://www.the-american-interest.com/2006/03/01/cool-jazz-and-cold-war/; "Types of Performances Given Abroad by President's Fund Cultural Groups FY 1959," November 24, 1959, Slide print, Robert Helyer Thayer Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (184.00.01), accessed Apr 15, 2018, http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/hope-for-america/blurringlines/culturaldiplomacy/Assets/bhp0184p1_enlarge.jpg.

[10] Elizabeth V. McGregor, *Jazz and Postwar French Identity: Improvising the Nation* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2016), accessed Apr 14, 2018, Google Books; Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*, 79.

suppression of the Soviet Bloc.[11] Through jazz, America hoped to subvert the rigid order of Communist Eastern Europe and, ideally, imbue its youths with "a degree of interest in the western way of life."[12] Equally important was jazz's potential to offset embarrassing allegations of U.S. hypocrisy over segregation and racial unrest in the American South. With civil rights tensions flaring up at home, the U.S. could rely on African-American music—and especially its African-American performers—to "rescue America's prestige" when it came to race relations and to demonstrate that the United States was making progress on the race issue.[13]

U.S. cultural victory would not be so easily secured, however, for Communist leaders already understood and resented jazz's propagandistic potential. Denouncing the genre as a foreign import of "cultural barbarism aimed at conditioning people for war," the Soviet Union and its satellites harbored intense fears that jazz would exact a "corrupting influence" on the socialist ethic of their populations, most of all their youth.[14] Consequently, the late 1940s and early 1950s

---

[11] Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 17; Margo Shohl Rosen,"Willis of Oz: How Willis Conover Enchanted the Thaw Generation of Poets with His 'Jazz Hour' Radio Program." *Ulbandus Review* 16 (2014): 198, accessed Apr 14, 2018, http://www.jstor.org/stable/24391991.

[12] Gleb Tsipursky, "Jazz, Power, and Soviet Youth in the Early Cold War, 1948–1953." *The Journal of Musicology*, vol. 33, no. 3 (2016): 352, accessed Apr 3, 2018, DOI: 10.1525/jm.2016.33.3.332

[13] Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*, 77, 85.

[14] Central File: Decimal File 962B.40, Other Internal Affairs, Communications, Transportation, Science., Russian Zone, Radio, Radio Broadcasting, Radio-Telegraph, Reception, Monitoring., March 22, 1950 - November 4, 1953. March 22, 1950 - November 4, 1953, Records of the Department of State relating to Internal Affairs: Germany 1950-54, U.S. National Archives, Archives Unbound, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://goo.gl/2P9kx4; William J. Risch, *Youth and Rock in the Soviet Bloc: Youth Cultures, Music, and the State in Russia and Eastern Europe* (Lanham: Lexington

witnessed the rollout of the Kremlin's "anti-cosmopolitan" initiative to rid the communist world of all foreign infections—jazz being the foremost. Issuing a union-wide prohibition against jazz, jazz instruments, and western dances like the foxtrot and the tango, Soviet authorities inaugurated an era of rigid isolationism and cultural totalitarianism. Launched in tandem with this widespread suppression of jazz were Communist endeavors to promote a distinctly socialist brand of popular music. In Poland and the German Democratic Republic (GDR), for instance, Soviet puppets attempted to indoctrinate and motivate their citizenry through the commissioning of "mass songs," catchy proletariat tunes lyrically drenched with political rhetoric and Communist ideology.[15] While an appetite for jazz certainly persisted in small contingents throughout the Eastern Bloc, the state's far-reaching powers over life and culture in Eastern Europe nevertheless presented a formidable barrier to the spread of American jazz and its associated values.

To break past that barrier, the U.S. would depend on the irresistibility of its "Jazz Diplomats," both black and white. Forerunning a long queue of musical celebrities like Duke Ellington, Benny Goodman, Thelonious Monk, and Miles Davis, African-American trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie was the first jazz performer commissioned to travel abroad under State Department sponsorship in 1956—but only because his contract cost less than Louis Armstrong's at that time.[16] Internationally beloved and wildly successful in European tours since the 1930s, "Satchmo" Armstrong had soared

---

Books, 2015), 25, 44, accessed Apr 14, 2018, EBSCOhost eBook Collection.

[15] Gleb Tsipursky, "Jazz, Power, and Soviet Youth in the Early Cold War, 332-334, 338-339; Risch, *Youth and Rock in the Soviet Bloc*, 44-45.

[16] Gioia, "Cool Jazz and Cold War," n.p.; Pierangelo Castagneto, "Ambassador Dizzy: Jazz Diplomacy in the Cold War Era," *Americana E-Journal of American Studies in Hungary*, vol. 10, Special

above his colleagues as jazz's "most effective ambassador" by 1955, according to *New York Times* Special Reporter Felix Belair.[17] Moreover, to quote Armstrong's friend and colleague Dave Brubeck, Armstrong was "probably the most famous American in the world" when the State Department began its tours.[18]

Yet some conservatives remained skeptical of Armstrong's effectiveness as an ambassador for American prestige, especially after the jazzman publicly excoriated President Eisenhower for his initial response to the Little Rock High School riots in 1957. Incensed by Eisenhower's delay in compelling Arkansas Governor Orval Faubus to obey a federal court mandate on school integration, Armstrong riled his critics by calling the President a spineless, "two-faced" leader. After Armstrong told reporters that the U.S. government could "go to hell" and cancelled his plans for a tour with the State Department that year, his detractors argued that Satchmo had lost all credibility as an envoy of American goodwill.[19] Relations between Satchmo and the State Department warmed soon enough, however, after Armstrong sent Eisenhower a telegram thanking him for his later deployment of federal reinforcements to Arkansas. Just three years later,

---

Issue on Jazz (2014): n.p., accessed Apr 3, 2018, http://americanaejournal.hu/vol10jazz/castagneto.

[17] Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*, 102; Felix Belair, "United States Has Secret Sonic Weapon—Jazz," *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Nov 06, 1955, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/113385875?accountid=11012. That same year, Armstrong released his *Ambassador Satch* album, which included live recordings from his recent European concerts.

[18] Gioia, "Cool Jazz and Cold War," n.p.

[19] Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 55-56; "Nations' Entertainers Air Views on Little Rock School Setback," *Plain Dealer* (Kansas City, KS), Sep 27, 1957, accessed Apr 14, 2018, NewsBank/Readex, SQN: 12C4FE1DFAF87B38; "Sayings of Satchmo," *Ebony* 15, no. 2 (1959): 88, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://goo.gl/yo1s3w.

Armstrong and his All Stars embarked on their first (and highly successful) U.S.-sponsored tour of sub-Sahara Africa.[20] Though Armstrong's Africa trip would be the extent of his official affiliation with the CPP, the State Department "was delighted to *claim him* as an ambassador" during his private forays into South America, Western Europe, and, ultimately, behind the Iron Curtain in 1965. As the U.S. sought to sway the cultural allegiances of Communist and Third-World citizens alike, Armstrong's superstar capital was simply "much too valuable" for the U.S. government to pass over.[21]

The roughly four years between Armstrong's trip to Africa and his foray into the Eastern Bloc would prove especially crucial in laying the groundwork for the success of the Iron Curtain tour, for within the Communist nations of Eastern Europe jazz was making rapid and significant inroads. As has already been suggested, the Communists' efforts to constrain "musical life" via state censorship of jazz and western dance proved largely effective in the postwar period. Thanks to the aforementioned *Voice of America* programs and the swelling fandom of underground "Jazz enthusiasts," however, Communist citizens and their officials gradually succumbed to the "alluring" jives of the West. At the dawn of the sixties, increasingly pro-western initiatives in Josep Tito's Yugoslavia coincided with Soviet concerns over "'the penetration of American non-culture'" into Poland and the

---

[20] Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 55; Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 58; Memorandum for Mr. McGeorge Bundy, 11/30/61, 1, Department of State: General, 11/22/61-11/30/61, JFK and Foreign Affairs, Part 1: National Security Files, Section 3: Departments & Agencies File, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library, Archives Unbound, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://goo.gl/FpnPJ6. In this report to the Kennedy White House, the State Department praised Armstrong's tour as a prime example of CPP's "effectiveness," declaring that he had "conquered" sub-Sahara Africa.

[21] Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 64 (emphasis added).

GDR.[22] In Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Romania, moreover, a flourishing of jazz clubs and cafés signaled a weakened Communist resistance to western influences.[23]

Yet these cultural wins paled in comparison to America's subsequent gains within the Soviet Union itself. As "internationalist impulses" reached a new zenith among Soviet youth and Premier Nikita Khrushchev demonstrated a certain degree of tolerance for state-regulated jazz performances, the U.S. secured a key agreement to send the University of Michigan Symphony Band on an official tour of the Soviet Union in early 1961.[24] Not long after, jazz artist Benny Goodman made his own debut in the USSR to appreciative audiences, including Khrushchev.[25] Starting in 1963, moreover, Soviet leaders initiated a period of *cultural* "'détente'" with the United States by relaxing restrictions on both the performance of American jazz pieces and the operation of jazz clubs throughout the USSR. By the mid-sixties, the Soviets had all but forsaken the "cultural barbarism" label—from then on, jazz was to be regarded as "serious music" worthy of appreciation, cultivation, and critique.[26]

---

[22] Tsipursky, "Jazz, Power, and Soviet Youth," 343, 347; Risch, *Youth and Rock in the Soviet Bloc*, 52.

[23] Eric Bourne, "Jazz in the Soviet Sphere," *The Christian Science Monitor* (1908-Current File), Apr 03, 1962, accessed Apr 18, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/510329893?accountid=11012.

[24] Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 91-92.

[25] Ibid., 94. Soviet leaders flatly refused to invite Armstrong, citing the concern that his boisterous performances would ignite riots across USSR; Bourne, "Jazz in the Soviet Sphere."

[26] Ibid., 97; "Ambassador with Trumpet," *Chicago Tribune (1963-Current File)*, Mar 30, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/179848148?accountid=11012. In this particular article, the author refers to the cultural détente period as "a cultural exchange kick" between Moscow and Washington.

Understood in the context of world events, these critical developments in the jazz relations between America and the Eastern Bloc during the lead-up to Armstrong's 1965 tour take on a more remarkable hue. That the USSR accepted Benny Goodman just after the U.S.-orchestrated fiasco at the Bay of Pigs in the spring of 1961 reveals the extent to which authorities felt pressured to appease their populations' gnawing "hunger for jazz" and Western culture *despite* their outrage over alleged American military aggression. Furthermore, the construction of the Berlin Wall in 1961 and the onset of the Cuban Missile Crisis a year later saw Cold War tensions reach their pinnacle, and by 1965/1966 American involvement in Vietnam had elicited threats of a cultural "'freeze'" from Romania, Czechoslovakia, and the USSR. Even so, Communist concessions to the "creativity and freedom" of jazz continued to abound throughout this period.[27] Simply put, the worst "political disputes" or setbacks in international relations could not hamper jazz's seductive appeal: the citizenry of Eastern Europe had fallen for jazz hook, line, and sinker—and they wanted more. Overcoming a wealth of confounding factors, then, America's powerful "Secret Sonic Weapon" had, by 1965, paved the way for a dramatic and definitive demonstration of U.S. cultural victory in the Eastern Bloc. The time had arrived for Louis Armstrong and his All Stars to work their magic.[28]

II. Satchmo on Tour: The Climax of Cultural Victory

In 1965, Armstrong was still coasting on the success of his latest hit single—a jazzed-up rendition of "Hello,

---

[27] Ibid., 97-99; "Russians Devouring U.S. Culture," *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Jul 04, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548845089?accountid=11012.

[28] Ibid., 98; Belair, "United States Has Secret Sonic Weapon—Jazz."

Dolly!" taken from the Broadway production of the same name and released in the spring of 1964. The tune, which topped the Beatles' "Can't Buy Me Love" on the charts and even became the official anthem of the 1964 Democratic National Convention (rewritten as "Hello, Lyndon! [Johnson]"), grew into a worldwide sensation by November 1964. During Armstrong's 1964 tours of Asian countries like India and South Korea, especially, the number elicited wild enthusiasm and crowd participation never-before-seen by the All Star crew.[29] As they soon became aware, though, audiences in the Eastern Bloc (and especially in the GDR) also shared a great fondness for the track and were themselves hankering for a live Satchmo performance.

After toying with the idea of breaching the Iron Curtain for years, Armstrong finally granted Eastern Europeans their wish. Securing arrangements for twenty-eight concerts through his agent, Joe Glaser, Satchmo and his six All Stars embarked on March 9, 1965, for a four-week tour of five Communist nations: Czechoslovakia, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and East Germany.[30] The unprecedented responses

---

[29] Ricky Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World: The Magic of Louis Armstrong's Later Years* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2011), 218, 229; Joe Nocera,"Louis Armstrong, the Real Ambassador," *New York Times*, May 1, 2015, accessed Apr 3, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/02/opinion/joe-nocera-louis-armstrong-the-real-ambassador.html; John P. Shanley,"'Hello, Lyndon!' Joins Campaign at Democratic Parley Next Week," *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Aug 21, 1964, accessed Apr 14, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115893475?accountid=11012.

[30] "Iron Curtain Dislike for Jazz OK with Satch," *Afro-American* (1893-1988), Mar 20, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/532150875?accountid=11012; "Iron Curtain Not Noticeable to Armstrong," *Los Angeles Times* (1923-Current File), Apr 10, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/155168230?accountid=11012; Stein, "Onkel

they would garner from audiences in each of those countries would prove to the United States, the Communist Bloc, and the rest of the watching world, that jazz—or, more broadly, American popular culture—was truly "erod[ing] the Soviet system from within."[31] As the evidence will demonstrate, reporters at home and abroad would declare the tour a pivotal cultural triumph—both for the entertainer and for the United States as a whole—before Armstrong's trip had even finished.

On March 12, the All Stars made their first stop in Prague, Czechoslovakia, a city that had already earned a reputation as a "center of jazz activity in the Eastern [B]loc." There to welcome them with decorum and style was Czechoslovak Prime Minister Alexander Dubček, along with an entourage of VIP's and consuls from Europe, Africa, China, and Russia that had been summoned to attend Armstrong's debut performance that evening. Opening to an energetic crowd at Lucerna Hall, Satchmo and his bandsmen made headlines with their riveting performances of "Royal Garden Blues," "Struttin' with Some Barbecue," and, of course, "Hello, Dolly!"[32] Ovations for the All Stars after each of their concerts made such an impact on the Communist media that Radio Prague described the performance in terms of a classical Roman victory: repurposing Julius Caesar's dramatic "Veni, vidi, vici" pronouncement, the radio announcer

---

Satchmo Behind the Iron Curtain," n.p. In his article, Stein adopts the German spelling of "uncle" because "Armstrong had been embraced as *Onkel Sachmo* on several concert tours through West Germany since the 1950s." That Satchmo was considered an uncle-figure for the West Germans further demonstrated his momentous potential as an ambassador to the Communist world and prefigured his tremendous success in winning hearts behind the Iron Curtain.

[31] Nye, *Soft Power*, 50.

[32] Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World*, 231; Tom Baumruk, "Louis Armstrong - Hello Dolly," YouTube video, 06:00, Posted Nov 4, 2012, accessed Apr 18, 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ywl5kBVGclM.

instead proclaimed, "'Satchmo came, blew, and conquered.'"[33] Back in the U.S., the *Chicago Tribune* boasted that after "bowling down the Communists" in Prague, Armstrong's incredible performance had even persuaded the USSR to discuss the possibility of hosting an Armstrong concert of their own.[34]

As had been the case in Czechoslovakia, the citizens of Romania and Yugoslavia went into raptures upon seeing Armstrong. One U.S. reporter covering his arrival in Bucharest remarked, "...It's jazz by Satchmo that lifts [the] Reds," while the *Washington Post* credited Armstrong's sellout concerts on March 28 and 29 with advancing the Romanian Communist government's "cultural shift to the West."[35] Having presided over Bucharest's "jazz holiday weekend" with amazing success, the All Stars flew to Belgrade airport, where authorities had arranged to honor Armstrong with a local jazz band's performance of the gospel tune "When the

---

[33] Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World*, 231; Ilse Storb, *Jazz Meets the World—The World Meets Jazz* (Münster: LIT, 2000), 109, accessed Apr 8, 2018, Google Books.

[34] "Ambassador with Trumpet," *Chicago Tribune*. "Reds Reject Satchmo's Entry Bid," *New York Amsterdam News* (1962-1993), Mar 13, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/226755849?accountid=11012. Although the Soviets did not ultimately grant Armstrong permission to perform in the USSR, the fact that they even considered welcoming him after expressing disgust at his "riot[ous]" style a few years earlier reveals the extent to which the USSR—via the influence of jazz—had relaxed in its cultural intolerance for the West by the mid-1960s (see Note 22).

[35] "Romania Swings to the West." *Chicago Tribune* (1963-Current File), Mar 29, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/179844989?accountid=11012; "Satchmo Has Role in Swing by Rumania," *Washington Post*, Times Herald (1959-1973), Mar 29, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/142396892?accountid=11012.

Saints Go Marching In"—no small lyrical concession for an atheist regime that still heavily censored religious expression.[36] "Add[ing] another triumph to his tour of Eastern Europe," reported the *Chicago Daily Defender*, Armstrong wowed 5,000 "widely enthusiastic" comrades at the Belgrade Trade Unions Hall on March 31 before drawing in 8,000 hollering fans for another sold-out concert the next day. Once again, the Communist news sources sang Armstrong's praises: Yugoslavia's state news agency Tanjug marveled at the "tremendous excitement" of the concert-goers, even going so far as to remark that "the applause for [Armstrong] had rarely been equaled in Belgrade."[37] Although reports for the All Stars' April trip to Sofia, Bulgaria, have yet to be uncovered, one can easily deduce how joyous the reactions must have been, especially from a citizenry that—until

---

[36] "Romania Keen on U.S. Culture," *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 29, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548737262?accountid=11012; "The World This Morning," *Chicago Daily Defender* (Daily Edition) (1960-1973), Mar 31, 1965, accessed Feb 24, 2017, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/494138146?accountid=11012; "Yugoslav Crowd Meets 'Satchmo'' at Airport," *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 30, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548734090?accountid=11012; Paul Mojzes,"Religious Liberty in Yugoslavia: A Study in Ambiguity," *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe* 6, no. 2 (1986): 25, accessed Apr 18, 2018, http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ree/vol6/iss2/2.

[37] "The World This Morning," *Chicago Daily Defender* (Daily Edition) (1960-1973), Apr 01, 1965, accessed Feb 24, 2017, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/494148188?accountid=11012; "Thousands in Belgrade Cheer Louis Armstrong," *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Apr 01, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2014, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116798217?accountid=11012.

then—had been denied access to "all songs in foreign languages."[38]

Yet it was Armstrong's visits to East Germany—first in mid-March and then again in early April 1965—that would truly "seal the deal" of America's cultural ascendancy in the Communist Bloc. No major American artist had ever performed in the GDR—which was still not officially recognized by the United States—and, as Armstrong biographer Ricky Riccardi points out, "not a single Armstrong recording was available for purchase" in that country. Yet neither of those obstacles could deter "the most recognizable entertainer on the planet" from capturing the hearts of the East German populace.[39]

Premiering their act to a packed and roaring crowd of 3,000 in East Berlin's Friedrichstadt-Palast Theater on March 21, the All Stars performed their most electrifying show to date. The GDR's Communist news media called the 2.5-hour event an evening "the likes of which have seldom been seen."[40] Refrains of "Satch-mo, Satch-mo" recalled familiar rally cries of "Krush-chev, Khrush-chev," though the chants for Armstrong "were louder and greater than anything Khrushchev—or any other visiting Communist leader ever got."[41] Nonstop clapping, whooping, and stomping "all but

---

[38] Bourne, "Jazz in the Soviet Sphere."

[39] "Young East Berlin Crowd Cheers Louis Armstrong," *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Mar 21, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116807728?accountid=11012; Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World*, 232.

[40] "Crowd Sings 'Hello Dolly': Satchmo Wows East Berliners at First Red German Jazz Show," *Los Angeles Times (1923-Current File)*, Mar 21, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/155132708?accountid=11012.

[41] "March 21, 1965 (Page 1 of 156)," *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Mar 21, 1965, General edition, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819007857?accountid=11012;

blew down the Berlin wall," according to the *Detroit Free Press*, and as the band cued in with "Hello, Dolly!" a number of uniformed policemen and soldiers in the crowd joined in on the singing. Taking four encores before he "begged off" stage, Armstrong received a fifteen-minute standing ovation from the audience. Eyewitnesses described the scene as the "warmest [reception] ever given a popular entertainer in the Communist sector."[42] As if the audience's reactions were not confirmation enough of Satchmo's cultural triumph in East Berlin, the official newspaper of the GDR Communist Party—*Neues Deutschland*—applauded Armstrong as "a messenger of the good America, the America we love and respect."[43] Such Communist praise for the U.S. was simply unheard of—a striking example of Armstrong's ability to harness jazz as a formidable tool for cultural evangelism.

Traveling from the East German cities of Weimar, Dresden, and Gorlitz, an even larger audience of 8,000 crowded into the Leipzig Fair Grounds for another of Satchmo's sellout concerts on March 25. As the *New York Times* reported on March 26, "The red carpet was rolled out for [Armstrong]...and the press, radio, and television passed the word for days in advance." Armstrong's visit was so highly anticipated, in fact, that Leipzig's loudspeaker announcement program diverted time away from its report on Soviet astronauts to broadcast hourly information updates on the All Stars' arrival at the airport. Prohibitions on taping or filming the concert "went unheeded" by energetic audience members as they brazenly raised their handheld recording devices toward the stage.[44] "Stamping,...loud applause[,]

---

[42] Ibid.; "Crowd Sings 'Hello Dolly.'"

[43] "East German Press Cheers Armstrong," *Chicago Tribune* (1963-Current File), Mar 23, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/179837822?accountid=11012.

[44] "Satchmo Blows for Leipzig 'Cats,'" *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Mar 26, 1965, accessed Feb 24, 2017, https://search-

and…rhythmic clapping" accompanied the "Dolly" number, as expected, but the "war was over"—said the *Chicago Tribune*—once Armstrong broke into a refrain of "Blueberry Hill."[45] Eight minutes of applause and chanting drew Armstrong back on stage for an encore and several more bows—"the old jazz king" had scored yet another victory.[46]

All told, Armstrong and the All Stars played eighteen concerts in East Germany alone, drawing in approximately 50,000 fans from all over the country. His presence and performance together aroused "an enthusiasm that had never been known before" in the GDR, or, frankly, anywhere else behind the Iron Curtain. To again quote Riccardi, Armstrong had proven himself as an "icon, an institution," and an unstoppable cultural juggernaut for the United States. Years of radio broadcasts and "cultural relaxation" between East and West had prepared the way, but Ambassador Armstrong's Iron Curtain tour marked the definitive turning point in America's cultural conquest over Communism.[47]

In a significant way, the Soviet response to the All Star tour gave its own attestation to this cultural breakthrough. Armstrong had long expressed a desire to "thaw out those Russian cats" with a concert tour of the USSR, and—as stated earlier—the Soviet Union did indeed flirt with the idea of inviting the All Stars after their stellar debut in Prague. Yet, for unexplained reasons, Soviet authorities doubled back on their goodwill sentiments, and negotiations for a Satchmo show never materialized.[48] Just when it seemed the Russians

---

proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116799128?accountid=11012.

[45] Ibid.; "Ambassador with Trumpet."

[46] "March 21, 1965 (Page 1 of 156)."

[47] Stein, "Onkel Satchmo Behind the Iron Curtain," n.p.; Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World*, 237, 232.

[48] "Reds Reject Satchmo's Entry Bid," *New York Amsterdam News* (1962-1993), Mar 13, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-

"[didn't] want him," however, Soviet authorities began to warm up to Satchmo and American culture in general by rapidly increasing degrees.[49] Two months after the All Stars returned to the United States in April 1965, Moscow television gave Soviet audiences their first introduction to Armstrong during a jazz history special on the state's "Evening Meeting" broadcast. Overdubbing a film clip of Satchmo crooning and trumpeting to the German standard "Mack the Knife," the program's Soviet narrator exclaimed, "[Y]ou should see his face while he is singing—so charming."[50] Within weeks of the show's debut, *The Hartford Courant* declared victoriously on July 4, 1965, that even with "the current low ebb of Soviet-U.S. *political* relations," the Russians were "[d]evouring U.S. [c]ulture."[51] While the *Courant* commented on several "live[ly] showcases" of American artistry in the USSR—with U.S. museum exhibits, Hollywood films, and imported theatre productions serving as just a few examples—it reserved special recognition for Armstrong's Moscow TV appearance. More broadly, it highlighted jazz's role in winning the culture wars, adding: "American jazz has made what looks like a final breakthrough in recent weeks. It is played day and night on radio, television, and phonographs

---

proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/226755849?accountid=11012.

[49] "Touring Armstrong Must Skip Russia," *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 09, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548754235?accountid=11012; "March 9, 1965 (Page 15 of 38)," *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Mar 09, 1965, General edition, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819019555?accountid=11012.

[50] "Satchmo Stars on Soviet TV," *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Jun 24, 1965, General edition, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819068057?accountid=11012.

[51] "Russians Devouring U.S. Culture" (emphasis added).

that blare forth…from the open windows of Moscow apartments."[52] For this triumphant Independence Day announcement, the United States had Ambassador Satch to thank above all. It was he who, "in recent weeks," had poured out his energy and talents for the citizens of the Communist Bloc. It was he who led the final charge in the cultural battle of a lifetime—and won.

III. Satchmo and Authentic Ambassadorship: The Race Issue

At the same time he was bringing about jazz's cultural victory over the Communist system, Armstrong was also solidifying a more nuanced and authentic identity as the musical diplomat for an apparently "contradict[ory]" nation.[53] With the advent of a more vocal and activist Civil Rights Movement in the mid-1960s, the aforementioned allegations of U.S. hypocrisy in promoting freedom abroad while still allowing Jim Crow at home increased in frequency and intensity. Whether or not the jazz ambassadors kept touring under official State Department sponsorship did not matter: so long as black musicians like Armstrong continued to perform internationally as America's "unofficial ambassador[s]," they could expect to receive highly charged "political questions" about racial strife in the United States.[54]

By the time of his 1965 Iron Curtain tour, Armstrong had charted a rather unpredictable course with the race question. Throughout Satchmo's career, many African-Americans regarded his over-the-top "friendliness…and peaceableness"—especially in the presence of white audiences—as a kind of minstrelsy: rather than challenge a prejudiced system, they reasoned, Armstrong had instead accommodated himself

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 4, 82.

[54] Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*, 109, 93.

to it and played along as a theatrical, happy-go-lucky Negro entertainer.[55] Famed jazz singer Billie Holiday echoed this sentiment when she reportedly exclaimed, "God bless Louis, he Toms' from the heart."[56] It did not help, moreover, that Armstrong appeared to shy away from anything remotely political or controversial. Whether he received an inquiry about racism in the U.S. or a question about his role in fighting the Cold War, his response was usually "[I don't know] about politics," or "I don't dive into politics."[57]

Yet, as the Little Rock controversy referenced earlier attests, Armstrong *did* occasionally "dive into politics" with some heated rhetoric against racial injustice, even to the point of declaring in 1957, "It's getting so bad a colored man hasn't got any country."[58] His brief stint as the star of 1962's *The Real Ambassadors*—a satirical musical written by jazz duo Dave and Iola Brubeck to parody black ambassadors' difficulties in representing a Jim Crow America—further demonstrated that Armstrong was capable of lashing out against the U.S. government, albeit infrequently (the musical had only one premier at the Monterrey Jazz Festival before being scrapped).[59] When ghastly footage of police brutality against Martin Luther King, Jr., and the civil rights marchers in Selma, Alabama, aired on televisions across the United States on March 7, 1965—just two days before Armstrong set out for the Iron Curtain—the question burning on many minds was: how would Satchmo respond, if at all? Would he make a scathing critique of the United States, as he had done

---

[55] Storbe, *Jazz Meets the World*, 108.
[56] "Sayings of Satchmo," 87.
[57] Louis Armstrong, "They Cross the Iron Curtain to Hear American Jazz," interviewed by U.S. News & World Report, Dec 2, 1955, accessed Apr 8, 2018, http://germanhistorydocs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Vol.8_Chap.27_Doc.07_ENG.pdf.
[58] "Nations' Entertainers Air Views on Little Rock School Setback."
[59] Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 82.

in 1957, or would he resort to his usual schtick of "not knowin' about politics"?[60]

As it turned out, Armstrong did a little of both, putting an arguably greater emphasis on doing the former rather than the latter. Yet the overall tact, creativity, and poignancy with which he addressed American racism while traversing the Communist Bloc evinced the maturity and decorum befitting a "real" and emotionally honest ambassador of whom the United States could be proud.[61] Armstrong made his first protest against the atrocities at Selma while he and the All Stars were staying in Denmark en route to Prague. A news report out of Copenhagen on March 20 recounted that Armstrong had felt "physically sick" after watching the police crackdown on the Selma marchers, and he reportedly opined that racists in Alabama "would beat Jesus if he was black and marched."[62] Once he arrived in East Berlin, however, Armstrong refrained from openly censuring the U.S. in his GDR press conference. Calling Armstrong "as much of a diplomat as an entertainer," *The Hartford Courant* reported on March 20 that Armstrong "visibly disappointed" Communist newsmen after he declined to discuss the "race problem" in America. "I've got no grievances," Armstrong told them. "I love everyone. All through the South some of my greatest friends are white people."[63] While some might infer that Armstrong was "recant[ing]" his earlier position for PR purposes, he

---

[60] Armstrong, "They Cross the Iron Curtain to Hear American Jazz."

[61] Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 260.

[62] "'Racists Would Beat Jesus if He Was Black'—Satch," *Afro-American* (1893-1988), Mar 20, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/532191452?accountid=11012.

[63] "Treated Fine in South, Says Louis Armstrong," *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 20, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548744773?accountid=11012.

was—in fact—only shifting strategies.[64] As *New York Times* editorialist Joe Nocera articulated fifty years after the fact: "...[Armstrong] *did* have something to say, and he said it powerfully though his music." Indeed, rather than loudly "bad-mouth" the U.S. as he had famously done in years past, Armstrong demonstrated his own personal maturation as a cultural diplomat by expressing his criticisms through the subtlety and grace of his art.[65] To "break his silence" in the Communist Bloc, Armstrong would rely on the power of one particular jazz ballad.[66]

The song of choice was a 1920s classic called "Black and Blue," originally written for the theatre as a "dark-skinned woman's lament about losing out to lighter-skinned women." Given the number's controversial subject matter, Armstrong had removed it from his repertoire in the late fifties. With the rawness and cruelty of Selma still fresh in his mind, however, Satchmo opted to reintroduce the piece for his Eastern Bloc tour. According to Riccardi, who published a biography on Armstrong's later years, Satchmo's most moving rendition of the number took place during his second performance at the Friedrichstadt-Palast in East Berlin on March 22, 1965. Rather than perform the song *a tempo*, Armstrong slowed the band down, and as he adopted an uncharacteristically mournful countenance, he "assumed the air of a preacher, pointing a finger skyward" and soulfully pouring out his anguish before the transfixed audience.[67] Attentive listeners might have noticed Armstrong's poignant adjustment of the lyrics (a change he maintained for each of his Iron Curtain concerts): whereas the original song lamented, "'I'm white inside / But that don't help my case,'" Armstrong declared, "'I'm *right* [inside].'" Such a marked change gave the final stanza of the piece an even greater punch:

---

[64] Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World*, 233.
[65] Nocera, "Louis Armstrong, the Real Ambassador."
[66] Riccardi, *What a Wonderful World*, 234.
[67] Ibid.

"'My only sin…is in my skin.'" No press conference rant could have expressed African-American suffering so tragically, profoundly, or tastefully.[68]

By his own admission, Satchmo was no "front-line" civil rights activist.[69] Yet, in reviving "Black and Blue" for the tour, Armstrong found a way to make a "powerful…musical statement about race" in America, a way to stand in solidarity with marchers at Selma while still maintaining his decorum and poise as a cultural diplomat of the United States. In so doing, implies Daniel Stein—another Armstrong biographer and jazz historian—Satchmo proved that "music [could] further political achievements" just as well as, if not better than traditional forms of protest.[70]

Furthermore, in demonstrating a willingness to address American racism in his Eastern Bloc concerts, Armstrong actually fulfilled the highest calling of an authentic U.S. ambassador. Through jazz in general and through "Black and Blue" in particular, he both "enact[ed] liberation" and presented a "vivid picture of American democratic ideals" for those who suffered under totalitarian Communist oppression. Instead of harming or subverting America's foreign policy aims, Satchmo enhanced them with his own respectful and artistic "demonstration of free speech."[71] Simply put, in exercising his liberty to critique the shortfalls of his nation, Armstrong showed the Eastern Bloc the true meaning of American freedom and "the resilience of American democracy."[72]

IV. Conclusion

---

[68] Ibid., 234-235.
[69] "'Racists Would Beat Jesus if He Was Black'—Satch."
[70] Daniel Stein, *Music Is My Life*: *Louis Armstrong, Autobiography, and American Jazz* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012), 253, 255.
[71] Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*, 94.
[72] Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 55.

In recognition of Armstrong's "services to [his] country"—both as a champion of jazz's cultural victory over Communism and as an embodiment of cherished American freedoms—liberal Republican senator Jacob Javits of New York delivered a speech to his colleagues in the Senate chamber on April 17, 1965. Calling on President Lyndon Johnson and the U.S. government to "show appreciation to Armstrong for the...good will [he has] produced for the United States," Javits requested that Ambassador Satch be "seriously considered for a Presidential Medal of Freedom."[73] Though President Johnson ultimately passed on selecting Armstrong for that distinction, the prestigious Recording Academy posthumously honored the entertainer's global influence with a Grammy Lifetime Achievement Award in 1972.[74]

While Javits did not ultimately see his request granted, the fact that a U.S. senator felt so compelled to extend the nation's gratitude to Armstrong just days after his return from the Iron Curtain is significant, not least because it reaffirms the tour's "central[ity]" in the dynamics of the Cold War during the 1960s.[75] As Javits suggested—and as a wealth of documentation proves—the All Stars' tour of the Eastern Bloc was both pivotal and "triumphant," for it demonstrated to the world that American music and, by extension, American culture had undoubtedly coopted the wants and needs of Eastern Europe's captive Communist

---

[73] "Javits Urges Medal for Lou Armstrong," *Afro-American* (1893-1988), Apr 17, 1965, accessed Apr 8, 2018, https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/532139313?accountid=11012;
[74] Recording Academy GRAMMY Awards, "GRAMMY Award Results for Louis Armstrong," Grammy.com, accessed Apr 23, 2018, https://www.grammy.com/grammys/artists/louis-armstrong. Armstrong died on July 6, 1971. In 1972, his posthumous honor was called the Bing Crosby Award, but it was renamed in 1982.
[75] Stein, "Onkel Satchmo Behind the Iron Curtain."

populations.[76] After years of buildup and growing indications of cultural "'détente,'" Armstrong's "winning demeanor" and mastery of jazz finally sealed the deal. By the spring of 1965, America's investment in soft power had proven its worth with dramatic flair—the U.S. had "won" the cultural Cold War.[77]

Reverberations of this cultural victory were felt almost immediately within the Soviet Union—as stated earlier—but it is clear that they also extended elsewhere and further into the future. Less than three years after the tour, for instance, "inward dissent" and pent-up frustration with Marxism-Leninism drove Czechoslovakia to make an attempt at democratic reform during the "Prague Spring" of 1968.[78] By 1969, moreover, political relations began to catch up with cultural ones as the United States and the Soviet Union embarked on a period of nuclear "détente" with their Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.[79] Even with diplomatic setbacks like the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the resiliency and potency of America's cultural dominance in the Communist Bloc continued to grow. Furthermore, it is no coincidence that as America's cultural advantage over the USSR waxed stronger in the 1980s, so too did Premier Mikhail Gorbachev's willingness to pursue radical reform with *glasnost* and *perestroika*.[80] In the end, concludes historian Lisa Davenport, the demise of Communism in Eastern Europe and the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 may be attributed in part to the "allure and diffusion of modern jazz and Western cultural values." More than any other event before or after it,

---

[76] "Javits Urges Medal for Lou Armstrong."
[77] Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 97; Storb, *Jazz Meets the World*, 108.
[78] Gaddis, *The Cold War*, 185-186.
[79] Ibid., 199.
[80] Davenport, *Jazz Diplomacy*, 119.

Armstrong's foray behind the Iron Curtain typified that critical "allure and diffusion."[81]

Buttressing this Cold War cultural victory was Armstrong's heartfelt "enactment" of the very freedoms that jazz was meant to convey to its audiences in the first place.[82] Contrary to the accusations of his detractors, Armstrong was no "racial clown [or] political pushover."[83] Rather, years of experience had turned Satchmo into a "real" ambassador—a seasoned and dignified diplomat who knew how to strike a balance between promoting his country's democratic profile and "demand[ing] [d]emocratic accountability" from his national government.[84] In bringing the racial issue to the forefront of his artistic endeavors in the Communist Bloc, moreover, Armstrong fulfilled his responsibility as an honest spokesman for the American way of life, with all its inspiring virtues and tragic contradictions.

Given the breadth of the impact that Armstrong and his Soviet Bloc tour left on the United States and the peoples of Eastern Europe, perhaps it is worth this nation's while to revisit Senator Javits's recommendation. As America's "highest civilian honor," the Presidential Medal of Freedom is meant to honor the living and the dead who have made "an especially meritorious contribution to the security or national interests of the United States, world peace, cultural or other significant public or private endeavors."[85] By all accounts, Satchmo fits the bill.

---

[81] Ibid., 116.

[82] Fosler-Lussier, *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*, 94.

[83] Stein, *Music Is My Life*, 255.

[84] Von Eschen, *Satchmo Blows Up the World*, 260.

[85] National Archives and Records Administration, "The Presidential Medal of Freedom," The Obama White House, accessed April 24, 2018, https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/node/349666.

Works Cited

"Akwaaba, Satchmo." *Time* 76, no. 18 (October 31, 1960): 80-81. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. Time Magazine Archive, EBSCOhost.

"Ambassador with Trumpet." *Chicago Tribune (1963-Current File)*, Mar 30, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/179848148?accountid=11012.

"Armstrong 'Hot Licks' Beamed to Jazz-Starved Stalin Slaves." *Afro-American (1893-1988)*, Nov 22, 1952. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/531830116?accountid=11012.

Armstrong, Louis. "Satchmo the Great." Interview by Edward Murrow. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tvEE9zdHpcY, 1956.

Armstrong, Louis. "They Cross the Iron Curtain to Hear American Jazz." By *U.S. News & World Report*. Dec 2, 1955. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. http://germanhistory-docs.ghi-dc.org/pdf/eng/Vol.8_Chap.27_Doc.07_ENG.pdf

"Armstrong Starts European Tour." *Washington Post, Times Herald (1959-1973)*, Mar 11, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/142440806?accountid=11012.

Baumruk, Tom. "Louis Armstrong - Hello Dolly." YouTube video, 06:00. Posted Nov 4, 2012. Accessed Apr 18, 2018. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ywl5kBVGclM.

Belair, Felix. "United States Has Secret Sonic Weapon—Jazz." *New York Times (1923-Current File),* Nov 06, 1955. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/113385875?accountid=11012.

Bergreen, Laurence. *Louis Armstrong: An Extravagant Life.* New York: Broadway Books, 1997.

Boone, Raymond H. "Wanted: Soul Music in the Soviet Union." *Chicago Metro News*, Aug 29, 1981. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. NewsBank/Readex, SQN: 12B9C8A6D8B8EB20.

Bourne, Eric, "Jazz in the Soviet Sphere." *The Christian Science Monitor* (1908-Current File), Apr 03, 1962. Accessed Apr 18, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/510329893?accountid=11012.

Castagneto, Pierangelo. "Ambassador Dizzy: Jazz Diplomacy in the Cold War Era." *Americana E-Journal of American Studies in Hungary*, vol. 10, Special Issue on Jazz (2014): n.p. Accessed Apr 3, 2018. http://americanaejournal.hu/vol10jazz/castagneto.

Central File: Decimal File 762B.00, Internal Political And National Defense Affairs., Russian Zone, Political Affairs And Conditions. Elections. Political Parties And Groups. Political Refugees. Defectors. Amnesty. Revolutions, Riots, Disturbances. Civil War., January 3, 1955 - October 5, 1956. Records of the Department of State Relating to Internal Affairs: Germany 1955-59. U.S. National Archives (Archives Unbound). Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://goo.gl/poAtak.

Central File: Decimal File 962B.40, Other Internal Affairs. Communications, Transportation, Science., Russian Zone, Radio. Radio Broadcasting. Radio-Telegraph. Reception. Monitoring., March 22, 1950 - November 4, 1953. March 22, 1950 - November 4, 1953. Records of the Department of State relating to Internal Affairs: Germany 1950-54. U.S. National Archives. Archives Unbound. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://goo.gl/2P9kx4.

Clegg, Mindy. "When Jazz was King: Selling Records with the Cold War." *The Journal of American Culture* 38, no. 3 (2015): 243-254. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1862305730?accountid=11012.

"Crowd Sings 'Hello Dolly': Satchmo Wows East Berliners at First Red German Jazz Show." *Los Angeles Times (1923-Current File),* Mar 21, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/155132708?accountid=11012.

Davenport, Lisa E. *Jazz Diplomacy: Promoting America in the Cold War Era.* Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2009. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. ProQuest Ebook Central.

"E. Berlin Won by Armstrong." *The Hartford Courant (1923-1992),* Mar 21, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548742061?accountid=11012.

"East German Press Cheers Armstrong." *Chicago Tribune* (1963-Current File), Mar 23, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/179837822?accountid=11012.

Flere, Sergej."The Atheist Civil Religion in Communist Yugoslavia: the Broken Covenant of Tito's People." *Jahrbuch für Historische Kommunismusforschung* (2005): 216-232. Accessed Apr 18, 2018. https://kommunismusgeschichte.de/jhk/jhk-2005/article/detail/the-atheist-civil-religion-in-communist-yugoslavia-the-broken-covenant-of-titos-people/.

Fosler-Lussier, Danielle. *Music in America's Cold War Diplomacy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2015. Accessed Apr 15, 2018. EBSCOhost eBook Collection.

- - - - - - and Eric Fosler-Lussier. "Database of Cultural Presentations: Accompaniment to *Music an America's Cold War Diplomacy.*" Version 1.1. Last modified Apr 1, 2015. Accessed Apr 20, 2018. http://musicdiplomacy.org/database.html.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *The Cold War: A New History*. New York: The Penguin Press, 2005.

Gioia, Dana. "Cool Jazz and Cold War: *Dana Gioia, Chairman of National Endowment for the Arts, Talks with Jazz Legend Dave Brubeck about Diplomacy in 5/4 Time." The American Interest*, vol. 1, no. 3 (2006): n.p. Accessed Apr 3, 2018. https://www.the-american-interest.com/2006/03/01/cool-jazz-and-cold-war/.

Hart-Davis, Duff. "A Young Man in Russia." *The Sunday Times* (London, England), October 6, 1957. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://goo.gl/6pJDng.

"He's a Cat, Armstrong Says of Khrushchev." *Los Angeles Tribune*, Oct 2, 1959. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. NewsBank/Readex, SQN: 12C5FE3D105B7830.

Hope for America: Performers, Politics and Pop Culture. Library of Congress. Accessed Apr 3, 2018. https://www.loc.gov/exhibits/hope-for-america/cultural-diplomacy.html.

"'I Dig Some Dixie-Ites, 'Satch' Tells E. Germans." *Chicago Daily Defender (Daily Edition) (1960-1973),* Mar 24, 1965. Accessed Apr 14, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/494139719?accountid=11012.

"Iron Curtain Dislike for Jazz OK with Satch." *Afro-American* (1893-1988), Mar 20, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/532150875?accountid=11012.

"Iron Curtain Not Noticeable to Armstrong." *Los Angeles Times* (1923-Current File), Apr 10, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/155168230?accountid=11012.

"Javits Urges Medal for Lou Armstrong." *Afro-American* (1893-1988), Apr 17, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/532139313?accountid=11012.

"Jazz is U.S. Ambassador." *Pittsburgh Courier* (1955-1966), Nov 27, 1965, City Edition. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/202575037?accountid=11012.

"June 10, 1965 (Page 15 of 80)." *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Jun 10, 1965, General edition. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819063017?accountid=11012.

Lautier, Louis. "Capital Spotlight." *Afro-American (1893-1988),* Sep 28, 1957. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/531944406?accountid=11012.

"March 9, 1965 (Page 15 of 38)." *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Mar 09, 1965, General Edition. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819019555?accountid=11012.

"March 21, 1965 (Page 1 of 156)." *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Mar 21, 1965, General Edition. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819007857?accountid=11012.

McGregor, Elizabeth V. *Jazz and Postwar French Identity: Improvising the Nation.* Lanham: Lexington Books, 2016. Accessed Apr 14, 2018. Google Books.

Memorandum for Mr. McGeorge Bundy, 11/30/61. Department of State: General, 11/22/61-11/30/61. JFK and Foreign Affairs, Part 1: National Security Files, Section 3: Departments & Agencies File. John F. Kennedy Presidential Library. Archives Unbound. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://goo.gl/FpnPJ6.

Millstein, Gilbert. "The Sax Comes Up the Moskva River." *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Apr 23, 1961. Accessed Feb 24, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115406531?accountid=11012.

"Milkwaukee Night Scene." *Milwaukee Star*, Sep 12, 1974. Accessed Apr 14, 2018. NewsBank/Readex, SQN: 12C5615107237038.

Mojzes, Paul. "Religious Liberty in Yugoslavia: A Study in Ambiguity," *Occasional Papers on Religion in Eastern Europe* 6, no. 2 (1986): 23-41. Accessed Apr 18, 2018. http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/ree/vol6/iss2/2.

National Archives and Records Administration. "The Presidential Medal of Freedom." The Obama White House. Accessed April 24, 2018. https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/node/349666.

"Nations' Entertainers Air Views on Little Rock School Setback." *Plain Dealer* (Kansas City, KS), Sep 27, 1957. Accessed Apr 14, 2018. NewsBank/Readex, SQN: 12C4FE1DFAF87B38.

"New U.S.-Soviet Culture Swap Agreed." *Boston Globe* (1960-1986), Feb 23, 1964. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/366523499?accountid=11012.

Nocera, Joe. "Louis Armstrong, the Real Ambassador." *New York Times*, May 1, 2015. Accessed Apr 3, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2015/05/02/opinion/joe-nocera-louis-armstrong-the-real-ambassador.html.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs, 2004.

"Our Cultural Exchange with Soviet Russia." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Jan 03, 1966. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/549031618?accountid=11012.

"'Racists Would Beat Jesus if He Was Black'—Satch." *Afro-American (1893-1988)*, Mar 20, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/532191452?accountid=11012.

Recording Academy GRAMMY Awards. "GRAMMY Award Results for Louis Armstrong." Grammy.com. Accessed Apr 23, 2018. https://www.grammy.com/grammys/artists/louis-armstrong.

"Reds Reject Satchmo's Entry Bid." *New York Amsterdam News* (1962-1993), Mar 13, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/226755849?accountid=11012.

"Reds to Hear Louis Armstrong." *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Feb 28, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116820716?accountid=11012.

Riccardi, Ricky. *What a Wonderful World: The Magic of Louis Armstrong's Later Years*. New York: Pantheon Books, 2011.

Risch, William J. *Youth and Rock in the Soviet Bloc: Youth Cultures, Music, and the State in Russia and Eastern Europe*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2015. Accessed April 14, 2018. EBSCOhost eBook Collection.

"Romania Keen on U.S. Culture." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 29, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548737262?accountid=11012.

"Romania Swings to the West." *Chicago Tribune* (1963-Current File), Mar 29, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/179844989?accountid=11012.

Rosen, Margo Shohl. "Willis of Oz: How Willis Conover Enchanted the Thaw Generation of Poets with His 'Jazz Hour' Radio Program." *Ulbandus Review* 16 (2014):

198-221. Accessed Apr 14, 2018. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24391991.

"Russians Devouring U.S. Culture." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Jul 04, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548845089?accountid=11012.

"Russians Hear Satchmo on TV." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Jun 24, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548829155?accountid=11012.

"Satchmo Blows for Leipzig 'Cats.'" *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Mar 26, 1965. Accessed Feb 24, 2017. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116799128?accountid=11012.

"Satchmo Has Role in Swing by Rumania." *Washington Post*, Times Herald (1959-1973), Mar 29, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/142396892?accountid=11012.

"Satchmo May Play behind Iron Curtain." *Plain Dealer* (Kansas City, KS). July 5, 1957. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. NewsBank/Readex, SQN: 12C4FE038C7D2C90.

"Satchmo Stars on Soviet TV." *Detroit Free Press* (1923-1999), Jun 24, 1965, General Edition. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1819068057?accountid=11012.

Saunders, Frances S. *The Cultural Cold War: The CIA and the World of Arts and Letters*. New York: The New York Press, 1999.

"Sayings of Satchmo," *Ebony* 15, no. 2 (1959): 85-88. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://goo.gl/yo1s3w.

Shanley, John P. "'Hello, Lyndon!' Joins Campaign at Democratic Parley Next Week." *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Aug 21, 1964. Accessed Apr 14, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115893475?accountid=11012.

Sis, Peter. "Behind the Wall." *Forbes.com*, Nov 11, 2009. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://www.forbes.com/2009/11/11/berlin-wall-communism-censorship-opinions-berlin-wall-09-contributors-peter-sis.html#304f1f512344.

"Soviet Scores Visit." *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Oct 29, 1960. Accessed Feb 24, 2017. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115130451?accountid=11012.

Stein, Daniel. "Onkel Satchmo Behind the Iron Curtain: The Transatlantic Politics of Louis Armstrong's Visit to East Germany." *Americana: The Journal of American Popular Culture*, vol. 13, no. 1 (2014): n.p. Accessed Apr 3, 2018. http://www.americanpopularculture.com/journal/articles/spring_2014/stein.htm.

- - - - - - -. *Music Is My Life: Louis Armstrong, Autobiography, and American Jazz*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2012.

Storb, Ilse. *Jazz Meets the World—The World Meets Jazz*. Münster: LIT, 2000. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. Google Books.

Thayer, Mary. "Culture is the Coin of Diplomacy." *Washington Post*, August 23, 1959. Accessed Feb 24, 2017.

http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/hope-for-america/cultural-diplomacy.html#obj0.

"The 'Cats' from Russia Dig Satchmo." *Afro-American* (1893-1988), Dec 10, 1955. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/531927392?accountid=1101.

"The World This Morning." *Chicago Daily Defender* (Daily Edition) (1960-1973), Mar 22, 1965. Accessed Feb 24, 2017. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/494130499?accountid=11012.

"The World This Morning." *Chicago Daily Defender* (Daily Edition) (1960-1973), Mar 31, 1965. Accessed Feb 24, 2017. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/494138146?accountid=11012.

"The World This Morning." *Chicago Daily Defender* (Daily Edition) (1960-1973), Apr 01, 1965. Accessed Feb 24, 2017. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/494148188?accountid=11012.

"Thousands in Belgrade Cheer Louis Armstrong." *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Apr 01, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2014. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116798217?accountid=11012.

Topping, Seymour. "U.S Aid to Africa Worrying Soviet." *New York Times (1923-Current File),* Apr 15, 1962. Accessed Feb 24, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/115668857?accountid=11012.

"Touring Armstrong Must Skip Russia." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 09, 1965. Accessed Apr 8,

2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548754235?accountid=11012.

"Treated Fine in South, Says Louis Armstrong." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 20, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548744773?accountid=11012.

Tsipursky, Gleb. "Jazz, Power, and Soviet Youth in the Early Cold War, 1948–1953." *The Journal of Musicology*, vol. 33, no. 3 (2016): 332-361. Accessed Apr 3, 2018. DOI: 10.1525/jm.2016.33.3.332.

Tucker, Bruce. "Living Metaphors: Recent Black Music Biography." *Black Music Research Journal* 3 (1983): 58-69. Accessed Apr 13, 2018. DOI: 10.2307/779490.

"Types of Performances Given Abroad by President's Fund Cultural Groups FY 1959," November 24, 1959. Slide print. Robert Helyer Thayer Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (184.00.01). Accessed Apr 15, 2018. http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/hope-for-america/blurringlines/culturaldiplomacy/Assets/bhp0184p1_enlarge.jpg.

"U.S. Regrets Satchmo Plays in East Berlin." *The Atlanta Constitution* (1946-1984), Mar 20, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/1557811001?accountid=11012.

"Vassiliev Yellow Notebook #3," 2009, History and Public Policy Program Digital Archive, Alexander Vassiliev Papers, Manuscript Division. Library of Congress.

Accessed Apr 8, 2018. http://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/112858.

Von Eschen, Penny M. *Satchmo Blows Up the World: Jazz Ambassadors Play the Cold War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.

"World Wide Performances by President's Fund Cultural Groups—1959," November 24, 1959. Slide print. Robert Helyer Thayer Papers, Manuscript Division, Library of Congress (184.00.02). Accessed Apr 15, 2018. http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/hope-for-america/blurringlines/culturaldiplomacy/Assets/bhp0184p2_enlarge.jpg.

"Young East Berlin Crowd Cheers Louis Armstrong." *New York Times* (1923-Current File), Mar 21, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/116807728?accountid=11012.

"Yugoslav Crowd Meets 'Satchmo' at Airport." *The Hartford Courant* (1923-1992), Mar 30, 1965. Accessed Apr 8, 2018. https://search-proquest-com.libproxy.furman.edu/docview/548734090?accountid=11012

RECONCILIATION WITH FINITUDE:
NARRATIVE SELFHOOD IN KIERKEGAARD'S *EITHER/OR*

Eli Simmons

Søren Kierkegaard's authorship is notoriously enigmatic. Writing under a long list of pseudonyms, and speaking in a variety of voices that articulate competing worldviews and philosophical perspectives, Kierkegaard escapes any easy categorization (as, for instance, the "father of existentialism"). While this authorial complexity can serve as a stumbling block to some, it has led to the proliferation of a robust and interpretively diverse body of scholarly conversations. One such scholarly conversation that has developed in the contemporary literature approaches Kierkegaard's authorship narratologically, engaging his texts through the lens of questions relating to narrative identity and self-interpretation. Scholars such as Joakim Garff, K. Brian Söderquist, and John J. Davenport each take this narratological and hermeneutical approach in their own distinctive ways. Against the background of this burgeoning field of Kierkegaard scholarship, I will take a narrative approach to Kierkegaard's corpus in the following paper, focusing primarily on *Either/Or* (1843) and the theory of narrative selfhood developed therein.

The papers of the pseudonymous "Judge Wilhelm" that compose the second part of *Either/Or* offer a kind of roadmap for the task of selfhood, the task with which Kierkegaard is so singularly concerned throughout his authorship. Especially in his second letter, which Victor Eremita—the pseudonymous "editor" of *Either/Or*—has entitled "Equilibrium Between the Aesthetic and the Ethical in the Development of Personality," Wilhelm details the various moves one

must make and the various interior stages one must undergo in order to "win what is the main thing in life": one's self.[1] What then are these movements and these stages? How does Wilhelm understand the process by which a human being is able to become the self that she is?

Of course, there are many angles from which one might approach Kierkegaard's text to wrest from it responses to these questions and others like them. And indeed, as much recent Kierkegaard scholarship has demonstrated, it is hardly a simple task to pin down with precision any clear and consistent philosophical positions in the polyphony of voices that speak out from the pseudonymous authorship. Kierkegaard's texts—*Either/Or* included—are hermeneutically demanding, abounding with a semantic surplus that calls for constant interpretive vigilance.[2] As Joakim Garff rightly notes, "The plurality of voices, pens, positions, and literary jokers—which are also present in the most philosophical parts of the work (the *Fragments* and *Postscript*)—necessitates a never resting attentiveness on behalf of the reader. The reader must have a dual view, which not only grasps *what* Kierkegaard writes, but also *how* he writes what he writes."[3] With the hermeneutic complexity of Kierkegaard's authorship in mind, this paper does not pretend to capture the full scope of what is going on in Wilhelm's letters. Instead, this essay will provide one angle one might take when approaching Wilhelm's roadmap, an angle I will argue provides rich insight into the structure of human selfhood as Wilhelm sees it and as it appears elsewhere

---

[1] Søren Kierkegaard, *Either/Or: A Fragment of Life*, Translated by Alastair Hannay, (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 482.

[2] For deconstructive readings of *Either/Or* that are attentive to the implications of this hermeneutic complexity, see Elsebet Jegstrup's *The New Kierkegaard* (2004, p. 14-87).

[3] Joakim Garff, "'The Esthetic is Above All My Element'", *The New Kierkegaard* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 69.

throughout the authorship, despite this angle's inevitable hermeneutical limitations.

In the following paper, I will offer an account of Wilhelm's conception of selfhood and narrative identity as this conception appears in the second part of *Either/Or*, specifically in Wilhelm's second letter, "Equilibrium Between the Aesthetic and the Ethical." I will seek to illuminate the roadmap to which I gestured above, paying particularly close attention to the way in which Wilhelm understands the role of finitude and situatedness in the makeup of the human self. Thus, drawing upon other parts of the authorship—specifically *The Sickness unto Death* (1849) and *The Concept of Irony* (1841)—I will begin by offering a brief account of one way in which Kierkegaard seems to think that the individual can fail in the task of selfhood by not being properly attuned to the finite and concrete elements of the self that are outside of the individual's control. Having introduced this existential "wrong turn," I will then turn to Wilhelm's letter to examine his account of selfhood. Ultimately, I will argue that Wilhelm's roadmap offers a way back from this existential wrong turn, leading the human being into reconciliation with her finitude and all that it implies, equipping her to come into alignment with herself as the particular, concrete, finite self that she is.

1.2 The Wrong Turn

In the opening paragraph of *The Sickness unto Death*, Kierkegaard's pseudonymous author Anti-Climacus describes the human being as "a synthesis of the infinite and the finite, of the temporal and the eternal, of freedom and necessity."[4] In other words, similar to Jean-Paul Sartre's categories of transcendence and facticity (though dissimilar in important

[4] Søren Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto Death*, Translated by Alastair Hannay, (London: Penguin Books, 2004), 43.

ways),[5] a human being is not just freedom, will, or imagination (the infinite), but is also embodied, culturally and historically situated, intersubjectively determined, and socially embedded (the finite).

In many ways, this formula serves as the background against which Kierkegaard thinks through selfhood throughout his authorship. One way Kierkegaard seems to think the human being fails in the task of selfhood is by failing to bring these two dialectical poles of his existence into alignment, by overemphasizing the infinite part of the dialectic to the denial of the finite. In other words, the human being chooses to downplay or ignore all of the parts of himself that are outside of his control—his particular lived body, his unchosen national identity, his concrete personal history, his familial entanglements, and so on—in order to magnify his existential freedom to shape and determine his own identity. This rejection of actuality, the rejection of one's concrete situatedness, results for Kierkegaard in a profound existential discontinuity. The self, having rejected one side of the dialectic of existence, becomes lost in its imaginative power of self-interpretation, distanced from its concrete existential situation. In *The Sickness unto Death*, Kierkegaard examines this phenomenon under the guise of defiant despair, in *The Concept of Irony*, under the guise of romantic irony, and in *Either/Or*, through the character of Aesthete A. We will look briefly at these three examples in order to establish the existential illness to which Judge Wilhelm provides a possible remedy.

2.1 Defiant Despair

Though his nosology of spiritual ailments includes a variety of types of despair, we are concerned here with what Anti-Climacus calls "defiant despair." Defiant despair is the kind of wrong turn just described whereby the human being,

[5] For more on the relationship between Kierkegaard's and Sartre's ideas on transcendence and facticity, see Pattison 1997, 80-84.

losing sight of the actuality that puts up resistance to his existential freedom, overemphasizes his freedom to create and interpret his own existence according to his whims and desires. Anti-Climacus describes this kind of despair as follows:

> The self wants in despair to rule over himself, or create himself, make this self the self he wants to be, determine what he will have and what he will not have in his concrete self. His concrete self, or his concreteness, has indeed necessity and limits, is this quite definite thing, with these aptitudes, predispositions, etc., in this concrete set of circumstances, etc. But by means of the infinite form, the negative self, he wants first to refashion the whole thing in order to get out of it a self such as he wants, produced by means of the infinite form of the negative self—and it is in this way he wants to be himself.[6]

Thus the self in defiant despair rejects its concreteness and its finite situatedness while overemphasizing its powers of imaginative self-interpretation. The self wants to tell a new and original story about itself and wants to be able to retell this story at a moment's notice with fresh details. However, for Anti-Climacus, such an existential orientation results ultimately in a loss of existential continuity, for "just when [the self] seems on the point of having the building finished, at a whim it can dissolve the whole thing into nothing."[7] As K. Brian Söderquist puts it, such a self, whose narrative identity dissolves ultimately into a fiction, "is haunted by the possibility of starting all over again with a new interpretation."[8] In the end, like a stage actor for whom after many years the bounda-

---

[6] *SUD*, 99.
[7] Ibid., 101.
[8] K. Brian Söderquist, "Authoring a Self", *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (2009), 153.

ries between self and role have disturbingly dissolved, the despairing self can no longer recognize the true from the fictional self-narrative. Such an individual, lacking even the semblance of internal continuity, becomes incomprehensible to himself, "an enigma" and mere mystification.[9] The despairing self's given, concrete self has disappeared into its "fictional, masterly project, its own way of understanding itself."[10]

2.2 The Romantic Ironist

In *The Concept of Irony*, Kierkegaard examines the same type of existential misalignment Anti-Climacus describes as defiant despair through an examination and critique of romantic irony.[11] In the doctoral thesis, alongside and through a sustained engagement with the thought of 19th century German philosopher G.W.F. Hegel, Kierkegaard decries the German Romanticism fashionable at the time (exemplified by Schlegel, Tieck, and the like) for its ironic detachment from concrete, historical actuality:

> As irony contrives to overcome historical actuality by making it hover, so irony itself has in turn become hovering. Its actuality is sheer possibility. In order for the acting individual to be able to fulfil his task in realizing actuality, he must feel himself assimilated into a larger context, must feel the seriousness of responsibility, must feel and respect every rational consequence. But irony is free from all this. It knows itself

[9] *EO*, 47.
[10] *SUD*, 101.
[11] For a more nuanced analysis of these ideas as they appear in Kierkegaard's dissertation, see K. Brian Söderquist's *The Isolated Self: Truth and Untruth in Søren Kierkegaard's On the Concept of Irony* (2007).

> to be in possession of the power to begin from the beginning whenever it pleases, for nothing in the past is binding upon it.[12]

Just as the self in defiant despair, the romantic ironist wants to take full control of his own narrative identity, and thus denies the concrete facticity—his own historical actuality, his past—that would put up resistance to his own self-understanding. But in the end, the story such an ironist tells to himself about himself is unbelievable, for the ironist is always conscious of his ability to start all over again from the beginning at any point. The ties that bind the ironist to the finite are clipped, eliminating the limitations that actuality establishes in relation to self-narrative. Again, as Söderquist notes, the romantics "deny one side of the dialectic of human existence, the finite side that we share with everything in the natural word, while affirming our own power to transcend the finite via imagination.[13] The Aesthete of *Either/Or* is guilty of the same, and it is to him that we will now turn before turning to the papers of his counterpart.

2.3 Aesthete A

Aesthete A, like his philosophical kindred spirits described above, holds at a distance from himself the actuality or facticity that could serve as the limiting horizons upon the infinitude of his existential freedom and upon his aesthetic self-interpretation; he denies the finite and the situated in favor of the infinite and the imaginative. Much of A's papers are concerned with the phenomenon of memory, and with the accompanying phenomena of remembering and forgetting, and here his denial of actuality rears its head. A, like the despairing self of *Sickness unto Death*, "wants in its despair to savour to the full the satisfaction of making itself into itself, of developing

---

[12] *CI*, 296.

[13] Söderquist 2009, 156.

itself, of being itself."[14] For this reason, he makes an art form of remembering and forgetting, whereby his factical history becomes an infinitely malleable fictional narrative that he can weave and reweave to fit his variable aesthetic disposition. For A, "one must...constantly vary oneself,"[15] but A is interested more in varying one's own self-interpretation ("intensive" variation) than in varying one's life situation ("extensive" variation), though the latter has an importance of its own.[16] On account of this aesthetic existential orientation, A hovers above himself, becomes a spectator to his own existence, loses any sense of textured factical connection to the shared intersubjective lifeworld or to his own given set of contingent, historical circumstances. In developing the art of remembering and forgetting, A thus also develops a way of living whereby he avoids ever being fully entrenched in or bound to his present experience, for to be fully present is to draw near to the world that A must hold at an infinite aesthetic distance from his self:

> Being able to forget depends always on how one remembers, but how one remembers depends in turn on how one experiences reality...Every life-situation must possess no more importance than that one can forget it whenever one wants to; each single life situation should have enough importance, however, for one to be able at any time to remember it...Having perfected the art of forgetting and the art of remembering, one is then in a position to play battledore and shuttlecock with the whole of existence.[17]

2.4 Existential Misalignment

---

[14] *SUD*, 101.
[15] *EO*, 239.
[16] Ibid., 233.
[17] Ibid., 234.

A, the self in defiant despair, and the romantic ironist all represent to various degrees a reoccurring Kierkegaardian theme: the existential chaos, incoherence, discontinuity, and misalignment that inevitably result from not properly attending to one's "given self,"[18] to the "larger context" into which one is thrown and from which one cannot extract one's self,[19] to the actuality, facticity, and the concrete reality that define one's situated existence as an embodied individual and delineate the limitations upon one's powers of self-interpretation. In his dissertation, Kierkegaard says of the ironist what could also be said of A or the despairing self: "Because the ironist poetically produces himself as well as his environment with the greatest possible poetic license, because he lives completely hypothetically and subjunctively, his life finally loses all continuity."[20] Loss of internal continuity is the inevitable outcome of the existential wrong turn I have outlined above. To follow Aesthete A in his denial of the demands of actuality, "to not merely think and speak aphoristically but live aphoristically,"[21] is to lose coherence or continuity as a self, for in this way one is not bound to any self-interpretation outside of the stories one tells oneself about oneself. And these stories are, in the final analysis, unbelievable, for the moment the story is told, the self "can dissolve the whole thing into nothing" and start again.[22]

We have thus shed light on the existential wrong turn by which the existing individual fails in the task of selfhood by denying one side of the dialectic of his existence: finitude. How then can one return from this existential wrong turn? For an answer to this question, we turn to the second part of *Either/Or* and to Wilhelm's papers.

3.0 The Papers of B

---

[18] *SUD*, 99.
[19] *CI*, 296.
[20] Ibid., 301.
[21] *EO*, 212.
[22] *SUD*, 101.

In his papers, Judge Wilhelm establishes his theory of ethical selfhood, a theory which attributes central importance to *choice*—specifically, to choosing oneself. For Wilhelm, selfhood begins in the act of ethical choice through which the individual chooses himself absolutely and thus takes responsibility for every element and aspect of his existence, the chosen and the contingent alike. Due to the brevity of this paper, I will not consider all of the dimensions of Wilhelm's account of ethical self-choice. Instead, I will focus here on Wilhelm's account of reconciliation with finitude and the existential continuity that results from this movement. Having ethically chosen oneself in one's "eternal validity,"[23] how does Wilhelm think the human being can become reconciled to the finite pole of her existence? Furthermore, how does such a reconciliation bring about an interior continuity that Wilhelm believes A lacks? What might self-interpretation look like in the wake of these existential movements?

3.1 Repentance into Finitude

For Wilhelm, one essential element of ethical self-choice is the movement by which the individual takes responsibility not only for what he feels he has chosen, but also for all of those elements of his identity that he has not chosen and that he can neither control nor interpret away: his particular "aptitudes" and "passions," his body and his "definite surroundings."[24] The ethical individual "does not want to erase this concretion" that he himself is, but "sees in it [his] task."[25] Furthermore, by taking responsibility for his definite concreteness, for the chosen and the unchosen, for both poles of the dialectic of selfhood, the ethical individual takes hold of him-

[23] *EO*, 516.
[24] Ibid., 542.
[25] Ibid., 545.

self as "a diversely determined concretion, and chooses himself therefore in respect of his concretion."[26] One way that Wilhelm describes such a total and encompassing type of self-choice is through the idea of repentance:

> [The ethical individual] repents himself back into himself, back into the family, back into the race, until he finds himself in God. Only on these terms can he choose himself and he wants no others, for only thus can he absolutely choose himself...it is only if I choose myself as guilty that I choose myself absolutely, if ever my choosing myself absolutely is not to be identical with creating myself.[27]

While there is certainly theological content to Wilhelm's conception of repentance, this concept need not be *only* understood in traditional theological terms. Instead, repentance is the word Wilhelm uses to describe taking hold of oneself in all of one's contingency and particularity, as "a diversely determined concretion,"[28] and refusing to leave anything out of the story. Although, in the end, we do receive our given selves "from the hand of the eternal God" according to Wilhelm's account,[29] we start by simply choosing to be precisely who we are, where we are, in our messy and complex particularity.[30]

---

[26] Ibid., 543.
[27] Ibid., 518.
[28] Ibid., 547.
[29] Ibid., 519.
[30] Söderquist notes in an analysis of *The Sickness unto Death* that, for Kierkegaard, "one might say that to be grounded in God comes very close to being grounded in God's gift of situatedness" (Söderquist, 2013, p. 7). For Wilhelm, as well as for Anti-Climacus, reconciling oneself to one's finitude and situatedness is inextricably bound up with reconciling oneself to the "power that established" the self (*SUD*, p. 44), the God from whom one receives oneself and one's existential situation as a gift. Though I do not focus on this

Whereas A "looks at himself in his concretion and then distinguishes one thing from another," seeing "one thing as belonging to him accidentally and another as belonging essentially,"[31] the ethical abolishes this distinction and takes responsibility for the entire given self precisely as it is given. This is why, for Wilhelm, one must choose oneself as "guilty," because otherwise it is left to the individual to interpret away those parts of herself or her past for which she would rather not take up responsibility. As Agnes Heller puts it, if the individual who does not repentantly choose herself as guilty "at any time does something out of character, she can say that she has not chosen it. Yet if she repented back into all of her life contingencies she could never say that she did something because she was determined by this or that, because she has chosen all her contingencies freely."[32] Thus, the category of guilt inaugurates the movement of repentance and dethrones the aesthetic or ironic individual's selective self-interpretation, calling him to take hold of himself in his entirety, calling him to repent himself back into himself as this guilty, particular, existing individual.

Having chosen oneself repentantly under the category of guilt, having chosen oneself as "this definite individual, with these aptitudes, these tendencies, these instincts, these passions, influenced by these definite surroundings, as this definite product of a definite outside world,"[33] one comes into alignment with the finitude that delineates the boundaries of

---

element of Wilhelm's conception of selfhood here, and while I believe we can instructively read his papers apart from their "theological" implications, I view these implications as essential to a robust engagement with *Either/Or* and with Kierkegaard's thought as a whole.

[31] *EO*, 550.

[32] Agnes Heller, "The Papers of B as the Modern Answer to both Aristotle and Kant," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (2008), 9.

[33] *EO*, 542.

the stories one can tell about oneself. In choosing himself absolutely, the ethical individual brings the dialectical poles of his existence towards alignment by freely choosing his own contingency, his own history, his own situatedness, and he thereby "assumes responsibility for it all."[34] The ethical individual "chooses himself as product; and this choice is freedom's choice,"[35] for Wilhelm's ethical freedom does not denote the aesthetic freedom to produce oneself, but the freedom to take up free responsibility for the produced self that one always already is. And it is precisely in this movement of reconciliation to finitude that one comes into "absolute continuity with the reality one belongs to."[36]

3.2 Existential Continuity

Joakim Garff writes that "In his criticism of the Aesthete's life, Wilhelm highlights repeatedly that he lacks any continuity in his existence, which consequently remains fragmentary and fails to transform itself into a genuine story."[37] That ethical self-choice is the ground upon which one can establish an existential and narratological continuity is brought into relief when Wilhelm writes:

> Only when one has taken possession of oneself in the choice, has attired oneself in one's self, has penetrated oneself so totally that every movement is attended by the consciousness of a responsibility for oneself, only then has one chosen oneself ethically, only then has one repented oneself, only then is one concrete, only

[34] Ibid., 542.
[35] Ibid., 543
[36] Ibid., 541
[37] Joakim Garff, "A Matter of Mimesis: Kierkegaard and Ricœur on Narrative Identity," *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (2015), 312.

> then is one, in one's total isolation, in absolute continuity with the reality one belongs to.[38]

Thus one's life is transformed into a "genuine story" when one stops trying to make up a new story, and chooses instead to take responsibility for every part of the story one has already lived—the story of which the self is indeed the "product."[39] Whereas the aesthetic individual looks back upon a disordered past in which his self dissolves "into a multitude,"[40] identifying himself essentially with this or that event but refusing to take responsibility for the whole, the ethical individual possesses "a history in which he acknowledges identity with himself" and through which he acknowledges that "he is only the one he is, with this history."[41] To imaginatively interpret away some element of this history, to pick and choose among the events of this history in order to wrest from it an idealized but incomplete self-narrative, is to do violence to the continuity by which the self is able to acknowledge "identity with himself."[42] The essential role of personal history in Wilhelm's account of selfhood is brought further into relief when he writes the following:

> For the eternal dignity of man lies in the fact that he can acquire a history, and the divine element in him lies in the fact that he himself can impart to his history a continuity if he will; for it acquires that not by being the sum of all that has happened to or befallen me, but by being my own work, so that even what has befallen me is transformed in me and translated from necessity to freedom.[43]

---

[38] *EO*, 541.
[39] Ibid., 543.
[40] Ibid., 479.
[41] Ibid., 518.
[42] Ibid., 518.
[43] Ibid., 542.

Garff describes the idea latent in this passage this way: "To acquire one's own history is the 'deed,' whereby one transfers the occurrences of one's past from 'necessity' to 'freedom.' What formerly was the individual's *history* becomes by this 'deed' the individual's personal *narrative*."[44] Thus, historical and narrative continuity is not something one attains simply by virtue of having a past, but is itself a product of human will; it is a product of the free choice by which the individual repentantly chooses oneself in one's absolute particularity. This is why Garff notes further that "Human being is thus always *defined* by its history, but never utterly *determined* by it."[45] Reconciling oneself to one's finitude and thereby coming into continuity with one's concrete reality does not mean that one is simply free from the work of self-interpretation, but it does mean that self-interpretation cannot be identical with self-creation. To move the dialectical poles of one's existence towards alignment is not to magnify the finite to the detriment of the infinite, for this too is a kind of despair—the despair of lacking infinitude.[46] As Anti-Climacus notes, "to become something concrete is neither to become finite nor to become infinite, for that which is to become concrete is indeed a synthesis."[47] Thus in the synthesizing movement of ethical self-choice, freedom remains, and self-interpretation with it, but ethical self-interpretation possesses responsibilities to its given actuality that aesthetic self-interpretation rejects.

3.3 Editorial Responsibility

Having chosen oneself as a "diversely determined concretion,"[48] having repented oneself back into oneself in all

---

[44] Garff 2015, 312.
[45] Ibid., 313.
[46] *SUD*, 63-65.
[47] Ibid., 59.
[48] *EO*, 543.

of one's finitude and contingency; having thereby come into alignment with actuality and established a free continuity with one's determinate history, Wilhelm is cognizant of the fact that the work of self-interpretation must go on. To recognize and take hold of one's finitude is not to abolish the narratological self-interpretation inextricably bound up with human reflexivity and self-consciousness (the infinite pole), but is to establish its limitations. The limitations within which self-interpretation thus takes place are the limitations of the given, factical context and the determinate history into which the self is always already thrown as the finite self that it is. Thus, for Wilhelm, the distinction between the accidental and the essential elements of one's given self

> is not the product of whim, making it look as though [the ethical individual] had absolute power to make himself into whatever he wanted. For although the ethical individual might refer to himself as his own editor, he is at the same time fully aware of his editorial responsibility to himself, in so far as what he chooses has a decisive influence on him personally, to the scheme of things in which he lives, and to God.[49]

The idea of "editorial responsibility" establishes the decisive chasm between Wilhelm's conception of selfhood and that of defiant despair, the ironist, and the aesthete. For, as Garff puts it, "Being an editor is to intervene in an already existing text."[50] The self is then not its own creator, but the responsible editor of the concrete, given self that it is. A or the ironist would like "to begin a little earlier than other people, not at and with the beginning, but 'in the beginning,'" thus creating themselves as if they could get outside of life, as if they could step outside of themselves and mould themselves from a God-

[49] Ibid., 551.
[50] Garff 2015, 314.

like vantage point.[51] Wilhelm, on the other hand, starts with the self as finite, as continuous with a particular history, as determined by a multitude of factors he cannot control, as thrown into a context he cannot escape, as "an individual who has these abilities, these passions, these inclinations, these habits subject to these external influences, and who is influenced thus in one direction and thus in another."[52] And it is as this definite individual, as the ethical self who has chosen himself in all of his particularity, that the self undertakes the ongoing and infinitely demanding task of self-interpretation, fully aware of his ineluctable editorial responsibility to the concrete reality that partially defines him.

To borrow another authorial metaphor from Söderquist, "the person who is sensitive to facticity recognizes that he is not his own creator; he must indeed assist in telling a story about the self, but his role is that of a 'co-author' so to speak."[53] The self is not its sole author, but writes within and alongside a text much of the contents of which are fixed by forces outside of the co-author's control, but which the self nonetheless freely embraces and accepts, thus translating "necessity to freedom" and taking up responsibility even for what the self qua co-author did not choose to write.[54]

4.0 Conclusion

In conclusion, Wilhelm provides in his papers one way to make sense of selfhood against the background of the existential misalignment that reappears at every stage of Kierkegaard's authorship. The way towards this misalignment is the rejection of the finite; the way back is the reconciliation with that which has been rejected. However, it is important to

---

[51] *SUD*, 99.
[52] *EO*, 552.
[53] Söderquist 2009, 158.
[54] *EO*, 542.

note that in lived experience, these stages are not always discrete and chronologically isolated. Indeed, the structure of *Either/Or* itself gestures to the possibility that the human subject is probably always caught up somewhere between these two dialectical stages, moving now in one direction and now in the other. And if Victor Eremita is right that the papers of A and B are "the work of one man" who has "lived through both kinds of experience" or has "deliberated on both,"[55] then these two existential movements tell the story of a single human self, and they thus have both existed or coexist within that self. Rejection of actuality is the condition of the reconciliation which B outlines, but this latter movement cannot be dogmatically secured against the former. Reconciliation with finitude remains vulnerable, porously open to the possibility of rejection, and Wilhelm's confident voice remains haunted by A's Diapsalmata that one could write like marginal notes along the edges of B's most triumphant turns of phrase. And perhaps, hidden from the reader's view, they are implicitly and invisibly scribbled there, whether scribbled by A or B it doesn't much matter. After all, they are probably one and the same.

[55] Ibid., 36.

Works Cited

Garff, Joakim. ""The Esthetic is Above All My Element." Jegstrup, Elsebet. *The New Kierkegaard.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004. 59-70.

—. "A Matter of Mimesis: Kierkegaard and Ricœur on Narrative Identity ." *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (2015): 311-324.

Heller, Agnes. "The Papers of B as the Modern Answer to both Aristotle and Kant." *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (2008): 1-13.

Jegstrup, Elsebet. *The New Kierkegaard.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.

Kierkegaard, Søren. *Either/Or: A Fragment of Life.* London: Penguin Books, 2004.

—. *The Concept of Irony: With Constant Reference to Socrates.* Trans. Lee M. Capel. London: Indiana University Press, 1966.

—. *The Sickness unto Death.* Trans. Alastair Hannay. London: Penguin Books, 2004.

Pattison, George. ""Before God" as a Regulative Concept ." *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (1997): 70-84.

Söderquist, K. Brian. "Authoring a Self." *Kierkegaard Studies Yearbook* (2009): 153-166.

—. "If The Human Self Were Self-Established..." *23rd World Congress of Philosophy* . 2013. 1-10.

—. *The Isolated Self: Truth and Untruth in Søren Kierkegaard's On the Concept of Irony*. Copenhagen: Søoren Kierkegaard Research Centre , 2007.

FROM EMPIRE TO DYNASTY:
THE IMPERIAL CAREER OF HUANG FU IN THE EARLY MING

Yunhui Yang

In 1511, a Portuguese expeditionary force, captained by the brilliant empire builder Afonso de Albuquerque (1453-1515), succeeded in establishing a presence in Southeast Asia with the capture of Malacca, a port city of strategic and commercial importance. In the colonial "Portuguese century" that followed, soldiers garrisoned coastal forts, officials administered these newly colonized territories, merchants engaged in the lucrative spice trade, Catholic missionaries proselytized the indigenous people, and a European sojourner population settled in Southeast Asia.[1] Although this was the first time larger numbers of indigenous people in Southeast Asia encountered a European empire, it was not the first colonial experience for these people. Less than a century before, the Annamese had been colonized by the Great Ming Empire from China.[2]

---

[1] Brian Harrison, *South-East Asia: A Short History*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan & Co Ltd, 1964).

[2] Han Chinese ruled the Ming dynasty after overthrowing the Mongol-dominated Yuan dynasty (1279-1368) and preceded the Manchu-controlled Qing dynasty (1644-1912). Annam, or Đại Việt was a Southeast Asian kingdom located in modern-day northern Vietnam.

Having succeeded in establishing their presence in Guizhou, Yunnan, Annam, Liaodong, and the southern Eurasian steppe in the early fifteenth century,[3] the Great Ming became the largest territorial empire ever created by ethnic Han Chinese.[4] Unlike the seaborne Portuguese and Spanish empires scattered overseas, the early Ming under the Hongwu (r. 1368-1398) and the Yongle (r. 1402-1424) emperors created a territorially contiguous empire modelled, in many ways, on the recently fallen Mongol Empire ruled by the Yuan dynasty (1279-1368).[5] Distinct from other early modern empires, the Great Ming between 1368 and 1449, when the empire was made and unmade, demonstrated an extraordinary flexibility in how they administered different parts of the empire. While some colonies, such as Yunnan and Guizhou, were successfully assimilated and became the legacy of the Great Ming Empire bequeathed to the Qing and contemporary China, others such as Annam ultimately drained both the Ming treasury as well as enthusiasm for further colonial expansion. In 1449, when the Zhengtong Emperor (r. 1435-1449, 1457-1465) was captured by a Mongol force at the Battle of Tumu Fortress, the Great Ming Empire, after experiencing military setbacks and colonial blunders over the previous several decades, became a simple "dynasty" once more and would rarely cross over its own borderlands again. The Great Ming Empire between 1368 and 1449, however, was not, as suggested by Timothy Brook, a great state "by inertia and in name," but

[3] Guizhou and Yunnan are provinces located in southwestern China; Liaodong, or the Liaodong Peninsula, is situated to the east of the Liao River, and between the Bohai and Yellow seas in northeastern China; the southern Eurasian steppe is the southern region of modern-day Russian Siberia.
[4] Han Chinese are and have always been the largest ethnic group in China, composing more than 90 percent of the population.
[5] For more information on the Portuguese and Spanish empires, see C. R. Boxer, *The Portuguese Seaborne Empire, 1415-1825* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969); J. H. Parry, *The Spanish Seaborne Empire* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966).

was as I argue the first ethnic Han Chinese great state in action and intention. This, then, is among the very first works of the early Ming as a colonial empire, a period we can best understand by studying the imperial career of Huang Fu, a famous bureaucrat and colonial administrator whose distinguished career spanned almost the entirely of the period of Ming colonial expansion.[6]

The Empire of Great Brightness

On January 23, 1368, Zhu Yuanzhang 朱元璋 (1328-1398) proclaimed himself the Hongwu 洪武 Emperor of the Great Ming 大明 (*Da Ming*) and the rightful successor to the Mongol Yuan dynasty. With no explanation or elaboration, the adjective "great" was added to the name of the new dynasty. Timothy Brook has convincingly argued that there was a shared concept of a "great state" in Inner and East Asian history and asked the question of whether the adjective "great" was merely a decorative prefix or an indication of the imperial nature of these states.[7] Brook perceptively traced the lineage of the use of "great" to self-glorifying non-Han Chinese dynasties such as the Khitan Liao 遼 (907-1125), the Tangut Western Xia 西夏 (1038-1227), the Jurchen Jin 金 (1115-1234) and the Mongol Yuan 元, but little discussed whether ethnic Han Chinese dynasties should also be considered "great states" or colonizing empires.[8] Although the Great Ming did expand into the deep south and southwest, conquered Annam and Liaodong, and established garrisoned oasis cities in the northwestern corridor leading to Central

[6] Timothy Brook, "Great States," in *Journal of Asian Studies* 75, no. 4 (2016): 965.

[7] Brook, "Great States," 957.

[8] The Khitan Liao, Tangut Western Xia, and Jurchen Jin were regional regimes of ethnic minority people that coexisted in northern China with the ethnic Han-dominated Northern (960–1127) and Southern Song (1127–1279) dynasties.

Asia, Brook argued that little territorial acquisition took place under the Ming and that the dynasty soon relinquished any form of great state expansionism after the missions of the eunuch admiral Zheng He 鄭和 (1371-1433) in the early decades of the fifteenth century.[9] Admittedly, Brook's essay deals with some larger questions, but to fully understand whether the ethnic Han-dominated Ming should be considered one of the "Great States" of Inner and East Asian history, I argue it was, and to chronicle its rapid shift away from the "great state" model, requires that we closely examine early Ming territorial expansion under the Hongwu and Yongle emperors.

Shortly after the founding of the Ming dynasty, the Hongwu Emperor ordered sequential northern expeditions to punish the remnants of the Mongol Yuan and drive them back into the steppe under the slogan "Expel the northern barbarians, Recover the land of Central Brightness" (驅除韃虜, 恢復中華). As intellectual and strategic descendants of the Great Mongol Yuan, however, the Hongwu Emperor coveted the lands remaining in Mongol hands, particularly Yunnan, controlled by Basalawarmi 把匝剌瓦爾密, the Prince of Liang, and southeastern Mongolia and Liaodong, under the government of the Uriyangkhad Mongol general Naghachu 納哈出 (?-1388). Over the next several decades, the Hongwu Emperor and Ming military forces rapidly defeated the remaining Mongol troops and occupied these lands, most never previously controlled by a Han Chinese dynasty. This first wave of military and colonial expansion constituted the main undertaking of the dynasty in its early years. The Hongwu Emperor as the preeminent decision-maker, along with his counsellors and commanders, worked exceptionally hard to integrate these new lands into the Ming Empire. To consolidate these new borderlands, the Hongwu Emperor employed distinct strategies: in Liaodong, garrisons including fortresses

[9] Brook, "Great States," 965.

堡 (*bao*), guards 衛 (*wei*) and battalions 千戶所 (*qianhusuo*) were ordered to be constructed in concert with the northern expeditions. Additionally, the Hongwu Emperor established several princely fiefs along the northern borderlands in Datong, Guangning, Ningxia, Daning, and Ganzhou, and entrusted his sons with their protection. In the southwestern borderlands, the Hongwu Emperor embraced the cultural incorporation of other ethnic groups by practicing the chieftainship 土司 (*tusi*) model thus consolidating Ming sovereignty through the promotion of obedient native chieftains. Through a series of aggressive military expeditions and administrative consolidations under the Hongwu Emperor, the initial borderlands of the Ming empire were established. The Hongwu Emperor's son, however, would prove an empire-builder like his father. The Yongle Emperor would push beyond the initial phase of colonial expansion by dispatching troops into the far northern Mongol steppe, marching to the tropics in the deep south, ordering dogsled armies into Siberia, and approving the famous series of vast maritime expeditions commanded by the eunuch admiral Zheng He to spread Ming influence throughout the present-day South China Sea and Indian Ocean.[10]

During the second wave of colonial expansion under the Yongle Emperor, the Ming took advantage of a power struggle between the Trần and Hồ families in Đại Việt and sought to enrich the diversity of the empire by sending invasionary armies into the tropics. Not for hundreds of years, the

---

[10] Herold J. Wiens, *China's March Toward the Tropics: A Discussion of the Southward Penetration of China's Culture, Peoples and Political Control in Relation to the Non-Han-Chinese Peoples of South China and in the Perspective of Historical and Cultural Geography* (Hamden, CT: The Shoe String Press, 1954). See also Alexander Woodside, "Early Ming Expansionism (1406-1427): China's Abortive Conquest of Vietnam," in *Papers on China* 17 (1963): 1-37; Lo Jung-pang 羅榮邦, "Intervention in Vietnam: A Case Study of the Foreign Policy of the Early Ming Government," in *Tsing-hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series 8 (1-2): 154–85.

Yongle Emperor would argue, had Han Chinese armies crossed into Annam. This time, the Ming government would conquer their troublesome neighbors and "civilize" them by making them into a Ming colony. To oversee the conquest and consolidation of Annam into the Great Ming Empire, the Yongle Emperor turned to a somewhat obscure and controversial figure named Huang Fu 黃福 (1362-1440). In 1405, while serving as minister of works, Huang Fu was impeached by the infamous Left Censor-in-chief 左都御史 (*zuo duyushi*) Chen Ying 陳瑛 (?-1411) for misusing laborers. As a punishment, the Yongle Emperor demoted Huang to minister of punishments and forced him to serve his duty in Beijing, a city in the midst of massive and dirty reconstruction.[11] The following year, Huang was embroiled in a corruption case against his subordinates. For his lack of oversight, Huang was again punished by the Yongle Emperor.[12] This time, he would be dispatched to the colonial frontier to oversee the Ming conquest of Annam, a mission that seemed like a certain death sentence in the infamous miasmatic atmosphere of the torrid south. Who was Huang Fu and why did the Yongle Emperor "punish" him with this important mission?

Huang Fu's Early Career

---

[11] *Ming taizong shilu* 明太宗實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Taizong Reign] (1430; reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1963), 41: 永樂三年夏四月癸未 (May 16, 1405). In *Ming shi* 明史 [History of Ming] (1739; reprint, Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974), *juan* 157, *liezhuan* 45, Huang is recorded as being demoted to minister of the Branch Ministry 行部尚書 (*xingbu shangshu*) in Beijing. For information on the Branch Ministry in Beijing, see: Edward L. Farmer, *Early Ming Government: The Evolution of Dual Capitals* (Cambridge, MA: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University: 1976); Xu Hong 徐泓, "Ming Beijing xingbu kao" 明北京行部考 [Study on the Beijing Branch Ministry], *Hanxue yanjiu* 漢學研究, vol. 2, no. 2 (December 1984): 569-598.

[12] *Ming taizong shilu*, 50: 永樂四年春正月丁巳 (February 14, 1406).

In the twenty-second year of the reign of Emperor Huizong of Yuan 元惠宗 (1362), Huang Fu was born in Changyi County, in what is present-day Shandong province in northern China. During the rebellions against the Yuan, Huang Fu's parents must have seen the potential to change the fate of their whole family in the education of their son. After a childhood studying for the civil serve examinations, fully reinstituted by the Hongwu Emperor, Huang Fu passed the highest level of the examinations and earned the illustrious *jinshi* degree in 1384, just four years after the bloody Hu Weiyong 胡惟庸 (d. 1380) Affair that rocked the entire Ming bureaucratic system and resulted in the end of the office of the grand councilor 丞相 (*chengxiang*). In these uneasy times, the gifted Huang, then only twenty-four, was appointed to the prestigious Directorate of Education 太學 (*taixue*) in the capital at Nanjing. After some time, Huang was appointed a registrar 經歷 (*jingli*), an anonymous, subofficial functionary office, in the Front Imperial Insignia Guard 金吾前衛 (*jinwu qianwei*).[13]

In the precarious political turbulence under the reign of the capricious Hongwu Emperor, Huang Fu managed to survive, and apparently thrive, by keeping his silence and only addressing the emperor to support the latter's positions. In what turned out to be the final year of the Hongwu Emperor's reign, Huang Fu was rewarded for his steadfast support by being promoted to a vice ministership in the Ministry of Works 工部侍郎 (*gongbu shilang*).[14]

After the death of the Hongwu Emperor in 1398, his grandson Zhu Yunwen 朱允炆 (1377-1402), the eldest surviving legitimate son of the short-lived heir-prince Zhu Biao

---

[13] *Ming shi, juan* 157, *liezhuan* 45.

[14] *Ming shi, juan* 157, *liezhuan* 45; *Ming taizu shilu* 明太祖實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Taizu Reign] (1418; reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1955), 257: 洪武三十一年夏四月丁酉 (May 7, 1398).

朱標 (1355-1392), ascended the throne as the Jianwen 建文 Emperor (r. 1398-1402). The bookish and impressionable young emperor, supported by the close associates Huang Zicheng and Qi Tai, immediately implemented a policy of reducing the feudatories 削藩 (*xiaofan*) to politically and militarily weaken the emperor's more powerful uncles. In response, the Jianwen Emperor's battle-tested uncle Zhu Di 朱棣 (1360-1424), kidnapped his younger brother Zhu Quan 朱權 (1378-1448), and the formidable Uriyangkhad Mongol cavalry under his control, and launched the so-called Campaign to Quell Disorders 靖難之役 (*jing nan zhi yi*) (1399-1402) against his nephew's central government in Nanjing.

During the confusing years of this infamous civil war between uncle and nephew, there is little known of Huang Fu's career. One suspects the unscrupulous abridgement and distortion of historical records to justify the acts of the Yongle Emperor by his historians resulted in the purge of many of the vital documents pertaining to the bureaucracy of the Jianwen Emperor, in which Huang Fu served. When the war was over and the Yongle 永樂 Emperor enthroned in 1402, Huang Fu was listed among the twenty-nine survivors of the "traitorous party" 奸黨 (*jian dang*) who had served in Jianwen's government during the war.[15] Although many of that "traitorous party" would be executed, Huang Fu immediately pledged his allegiance to the ambitious new emperor and was rewarded by being promoted to minister of works in Nanjing.[16] Was this a reward for steady, faithful, and sedate service for more than a decade in an important ministry? A reward for pledging his loyalty to the new emperor? An expedient decision by an untried emperor to staff his ministries with men of considerable bureaucratic experience? Whatever the case, the quiet Huang Fu served as minister of works for

[15] *Ming shi, juan* 157, *liezhuan* 45.
[16] *Ming taizong shilu*, 12a: 洪武三十五年 (建文四年) 九月甲申 (September 30, 1402).

several years until being embroiled in the cases against his subordinates mentioned above. Nothing in his career to date would suggest Huang Fu would prove to be one of the greatest colonial officials of the early Ming, or that he would have an illustrious career that would span the reigns of six emperors, but in June 1406 the Yongle Emperor ordered Huang Fu to "redeem" himself by supporting the ongoing military operations of Zhu Neng 朱能 (1370-1406), the Duke of Cheng 成國公, and Zhang Fu 張輔 (1374-1449), the Marquis of Xincheng 新城侯, and that career began.[17]

From Annam to Jiaozhi 交址[18]

In April 1403, just four months after being enthroned, the Yongle Emperor received envoys from the tributary state of Đại Việt 大越 (1054-1400, 1428-1804), who reported that the royal line of the Trần 陳 family had recently died out and Hồ Hán Thương 胡漢蒼 (d. 1407), the prestigious nephew of the deceased emperor, was being proposed as the new ruler. The reverent new ruler had dispatched these envoys to request the Great Ming Emperor for permission to ascend the throne.[19] The Yongle Emperor, focusing on restoring domestic order and consolidating power at the time, approved the request after a cursory verification.[20] In the following year, however, a refugee named Trần Thiêm Bình 陳添平[21] arrived in Nanjing claiming to be a survivor and rightful heir of the Trần family. When Trần was presented to the Yongle Emperor, he exposed Hồ's usurpation and begged for

---

[17] *Ming taizong shilu*, 55: 永樂四年六月辛酉 (June 18, 1406).

[18] In *Ming shi*, the official History of the Ming, the name appears as 交阯, but in modern secondary sources name of the colony is often written as 交趾.

[19] *Ming taizong shilu*, 19: 永樂元年夏四月丁未 (April 21, 1403).

[20] *Ming taizong shilu*, 25: 永樂元年閏十一月戊午 (December 28, 1403).

[21] In *Ming shi*, the name appears as 陳天平.

a Ming military force to help restore the throne of the Trần family.[22] Trần Thiêm Bình's claim remained dubious until Bùi Bá Kỳ 裴伯耆, an official from Đại Việt, confirmed Trần's tale. According to Bùi, the courtier Hồ Quý Ly 胡季犛 (Lê Quý Ly 黎季犛) (1336-1407) had staged a coup in 1400, slaughtered the Trần clan, and proclaimed himself the Thánh Nguyên 聖元 Emperor of the Đại Ngu 大虞 (also known as the Hồ dynasty, Nhà Hồ, 胡朝). Hồ then changed his name to Hồ Nhất Nguyên 胡一元, abdicated the throne in favor of his son Hồ Hán Thương, but remained in control of domestic affairs as the retired emperor.[23] The Yongle Emperor, apparently enraged at being deceived, dispatched an imperial envoy to scold the Hồs and ordered them to enthrone Trần Thiêm Bình as the emperor.[24] The Hồs responded to the edict by promising to swear fealty to the Great Ming.[25] The Yongle Emperor thus ordered five thousand Ming soldiers to escort Trần back to Annam.[26] Just across the border, however, Hồ forces ambushed the Ming escort and captured Trần, who was later executed.[27] The Yongle Emperor flew into a rage when the news reached the capital. He decided to send an expedition to punish "the contemptible scoundrel" who had dared to harass another Ming tributary state, the Kingdom of Champa, violate the sanctity of Siming

---

[22] *Ming taizong shilu*, 33: 永樂二年八月丁酉 (October 2, 1404); Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎 suggested that the Yongle Emperor may have already had plans to invade Annam in August 1404, which means he interprets the tale of Trần Thiêm Bình as a fabricated excuse. For more information, see: Yamamoto Tatsurō, *Annan shi kenkyū: Gen Min ryōchō no Annan seiryaku* 安南史研究：元明兩朝の安南征略, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Yamakawa, 1950), 285-286.

[23] *Ming taizong shilu* 33: 永樂二年八月乙亥 (September 10, 1404).

[24] *Ming taizong shilu*, 38: 永樂三年春正月甲寅 (February 16, 1405).

[25] *Ming taizong shilu*, 43: 永樂三年六月庚寅 (July 22, 1405).

[26] *Ming taizong shilu*, 49: 永樂三年十二月庚辰 (January 8, 1406).

[27] *Ming taizong shilu*, 52: 永樂四年三月丙午 (April 4, 1406).

Prefecture 思明 in Guangxi, and had insulted the Great Ming by his refusal to obey orders.[28]

In May 1406, the Yongle Emperor mapped out a campaign to invade Annam with two expeditionary forces—one led by Zhu Neng and Zhang Fu, approaching Annam from Guangxi—and another captained by the second son of Mu Ying 沐英 (1345-1392), a famous Ming general who had helped conquer Yunnan, named Mu Cheng 沐晟 (1368-1439), who would attack across the Ming-Annamese border through Yunnan.[29] To oversee logistical support, and serve as the administrator of Annam after it was captured, the Yongle Emperor ordered Huang Fu to follow the troops through the relay system, the "arteries and veins" of early Ming colonial empire.[30] On his journey to the Ming borderlands with Annam, Huang Fu recorded his experiences in a journal entitled *A Journal of a Voyage on a Mission to Annam* (奉使安南水程日記 *feng shi Annan shuicheng riji*). Three months after leaving Nanjing, Huang Fu joined the Ming armies encamped in the southern Guangxi borderlands.[31] While Huang remained in southern Guangxi handling civilian affairs and military logistics, Zhang Fu commanded Ming expeditionary

---

[28] *Ming taizong shilu*, 53: 永樂四年夏四月辛未 (April 29, 1406); *Ming taizong shilu*, 21: 永樂元年秋七月丁酉 (August 9, 1403); *Ming taizong shilu*, 30: 永樂二年夏四月癸酉 (May 11, 1404).

[29] *Ming taizong shilu*, 53: 永樂四年夏四月癸未 (May 11, 1406).

[30] For information on the Ming relay and post office system, see: Lane J. Harris, "The 'Arteries and Veins' of the Imperial Body: The Nature of the Relay and Post Station Systems in the Ming Dynasty, 1368-1644," in *Journal of Early Modern History* 19 (2015): 287-310, and "Into the Frontiers: The Relay System and Ming Empire in the Borderlands, 1368-1449," in *Ming Studies*, 72 (2015): 3-23; *Ming taizong shilu*, 55: 永樂四年六月辛酉 (June 18, 1406).

[31] Huang Fu 黃福, *Feng shi Annan shuicheng riji* 奉使安南水程日記 [Journal of a Voyage on a Mission to Annam], in *Annan zhuan* 安南傳 [Chronicles of Annam] (reprint, Taipei: Guangwen shuju, 1969).

forces in Annam, after the sudden death of Zhu Neng on November 12, 1406.[32] Under this brilliant new commander, Ming expeditionary forces swept through the orchestrated Annamese defense and successively conquered the strategic post of Duobang 多邦 on January 19, 1407, the Eastern Capital 東都 (modern-day Hànội) on the next day, and the Western Capital 西都 (modern-day Thanh Hóa) on January 26th.[33] Within six months, Zhang Fu's military forces had conquered Annam, captured the Hồ "pretenders," and declared the country "pacified" 平 (*ping*).[34]

On July 5, 1407, the Yongle Emperor issued an ecstatic imperial edict declaring to the empire the pacification of Annam.[35] In the edict, the Yongle Emperor legitimated the Ming invasion of Annam by tracing Han Chinese control over Jiaozhou 交州, the ancient name of Annam, and explaining that with the end of the Trần lineage, the Annamese people had petitioned the Ming to restore "civilized rule" after a period of "barbaric practices" 夷習 (*yi xi*).[36] The Yongle Emperor, "bending over and consulting public opinion, benevolently approved the ardent expectation of the Annamese people" (俯狥輿情, 從其所請), thereby granted Annam a new name, Jiaozhi 交址, and placed it under the direct control of a Regional Military Commission 都指揮使司 (*du zhihui shi si*), a Provincial Administration Commission 承宣布政使司 (*chengxuan buzheng shi si*), and a Provincial Surveillance Commission 提刑按察使司 (*tixing ancha shi si*).[37] In

---

[32] *Ming taizong shilu*, 60: 永樂四年冬十月丙午 (November 30, 1406).
[33] *Ming taizong shilu*, 62: 永樂四年十二月丙申 (January 19, 1407), 永樂四年十二月丁酉 (January 20, 1407), and 永樂四年十二月癸卯 (January 26, 1407).
[34] *Ming taizong shilu*, 67: 永樂五年五月乙丑 (June 17, 1407).
[35] *Ming taizong shilu*, 68: 永樂五年六月癸未 (July 5, 1407).
[36] *Ming taizong shilu*, 68: 永樂五年六月癸未 (July 5, 1407).
[37] *Ming taizong shilu*, 68: 永樂五年六月癸未 (July 5, 1407).

other words, the Yongle Emperor was planning to turn Annam into a province of the Ming.

To oversee the transformation of Annam into a Ming province, the Yongle Emperor appointed Huang Fu as both the provincial administrator and surveillance commissioner. He thus became the highest-ranking Ming administrative and judicial official in Jiaozhi; a frontline official in the Ming empire's newest colonial possession. Shortly after the new colony was "pacified," Huang Fu sent a memorial to the Yongle Emperor entailed *Panegyric on the Pacification of Jiaozhi* 賀交阯平定表 (*he Jiaozhi pingding biao*) offering proposals to administrate and consolidate Ming control in the new colony. Huang proposed "to follow the virtue of the sages in appeasing the indigenous people and to administer them without distinction" from Ming subjects; "to appoint magistrates to pacify the people and commanderies to control the population"; to station troops in garrisons to guard against disturbances; and to economically "turn land that had been grassy wastelands for thousands years into cultivatable farmland"; to transform people who had been barbarians for generations with tattoos on their forehead into civilized people; to produce clothing and food ample enough to feed and clothe the people; and finally, to introduce enough civilization to transform the strange local customs.[38] In other words, Huang Fu laid out a plan to administer this new colony by transforming it into a part of the central realm.

Huang Fu's Imperial Career in Jiaozhi

[38] Huang Fu 黃福, "Huang Zhongxuan gong wenji" 黃忠宣公文集 [Collected works of the honorable Huang Zhongxuan (Huang Fu)], *juan* 13, *bieji* 6 *juan* in *Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書 [Collectanea of works mentioned in the *cunmu* catalog], ed. Siku quanshu cunmu congshu biancuan weiyuanhui 四庫全書存目叢書編纂委員會 (Ji'nan: Qilu shushe, 1997), 333.

Between 1407 and 1424, Huang Fu faithfully followed his blueprint for assimilating the new colony into the Ming Empire. Almost immediately, Huang sought to make Jiaozhi into a normal province through redistricting administrative divisions and establishing institutions to guarantee the distribution and implementation of government decrees. Accordingly, the new colony was divided into seventeen prefectures 府 (*fu*), forty-seven sub-prefectures 州 (*zhou*), and a hundred and fifty-seven counties 縣 (*xian*).[39] He also oversaw the opening of eleven guards 衛 (*wei*) and one Military Inspectorate 巡檢司 (*xunjian si*) to defend the southern extension of the empire and three Maritime Trade Supervisorates 市舶提舉司 (*shibo tiju si*) to regulate overseas commerce, collect customs duties, and prevent the smuggling of contraband goods.[40] Huang also physically linked Jiaozhi with the Ming relay and post station network by establishing some 380 post stations and 29 relays stations running north to south in Jiaozhi by the early 1420s.[41] The introduction of new administrative divisions, opening of colonial institutions, and extension of the Ming communications system provided for the convenient flow of information and established a typical array of government offices for controlling a province.

After the war of conquest, consolidation also required reconstruction. Shortly after taking up his post, Huang sent a memorial to the Yongle Emperor suggesting the introduction of new tax system, but requesting a temporary reduction in taxes for war-torn areas.[42] The Yongle Emperor favored Huang's suggestion and ordered him to eliminate all

---

[39] Guo Zhenduo 郭振铎 and Zhang Xiaomei 張笑梅, eds., *Yuenan tongshi* 越南通史 [History of Vietnam] (Beijing: Zhongguo renmindaxue chubanshe, 2001), 398.

[40] Guo and Zhang, *Yuenan tongshi*, 398.

[41] Harris, "Into the Frontiers: The Relay System and Ming Empire in the Borderlands, 1368-1449," 12.

[42] *Ming taizong shilu* 77: 永樂六年春三月庚申 (April 7, 1408).

tyrannies 苛政 (*kezheng*) left by the Hồ dynasty and to replace them with a looser 寬簡 (*kuanjian*) system.[43]

While Huang and the Yongle Emperor were reducing, or at least claiming to reduce, the burden placed on the indigenous population, continuous military convulsions plagued the early years of the colony. The rebellions led by Giản Định Đế 簡定帝 Trần Ngỗi 陳頠 in 1407-1409, Trùng Quang Đế 重光帝 Trần Quý Khoáng 陳季擴 in 1409-1413, and by Trần dynasty loyalist generals Nguyễn Súy 阮帥 (d. 1414), Đặng Dung 鄧容 (d. 1414) and Nguyễn Cảnh Dị 阮景異 (d. 1414) resulted in an explosive growth in Ming military expenditures. Meanwhile, Ming control of Jiaozhi was also under a series of unremittingly attacks by the red garment rebels 紅衣賊 (*hongyi zei*).[44] In his letter to the highest Ming military general in Jiaozhi, Zhang Fu, who was granted the title Duke of Ying 英國公 for his service in conquering Annam, Huang Fu expressed great concern over the stubborn resistance in the colony: "there have already been three rebellions in eight years since the pacification of Jiaozhi and accordingly three expeditionary forces were required to be sent."[45] In addition to fierce resistance by the indigenous people, Huang found it increasingly difficult to supply Ming military operations: "If suppressing the rebels is easy, then appeasing the indigenous people is hard; if reassuring the

---

[43] *Ming taizong shilu* 68: 永樂五年六月癸未 (July 5, 1407); *Ming Taizong shilu*, 77: 永樂六年春三月庚申 (April 7, 1408). *Đại Việt sử ký toàn thư* 大越史記全書 [Complete Annals of Đại Việt] (1697; reprint, Chongqing: Xi'nan shifandaxue chubanshe, 2005).

[44] *Ming taizong shilu*, 218: 永樂十七年十一月丙午 (November 22, 1419).

[45] Huang Fu 黃福, "Feng zongbingguan Yingguogong" 奉總兵官英國公 [To the Duke of Ying, military commander], in Chen Zilong 陳子龍, ed. *Huangming jingshi wenbian* 皇明經世文編 [Collected writings about statecraft from the Ming dynasty], *juan* 20 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962).

population is hard, providing enough food for their consumption is even harder."[46] Since "transporting food from Guangxi overland is perilous and costly," Huang Fu encouraged Ming garrison forces in Jiaozhi to open up wasteland and farm for their own consumption."[47] Meanwhile, Huang Fu suggested the Yongle Emperor supplement military supplies by encouraging merchants to transport food from inland areas to Jiaozhi in exchange for licenses for selling salt 開中 (*kaizhong*).[48] The Yongle Emperor appreciated Huang's advice and implemented his plan accordingly. The promotion of the military *tuntian* 屯田 and *kaizhong* systems decreased the Ming's dependence on the tax revenue collected from the new colony for local defenses, which seems to have been designed to reduce the tax burden on the indigenous population and their resentment against Ming rule.

Huang Fu's most aggressive measure to assimilate Jiaozhi into Ming Empire, also the one that has caused the most controversy among Chinese and Vietnamese historians, was his policy to "sinicize" the local population. In an attempt to "reverse barbaric habits and revive Chinese customs" (變蠻夷之習, 復華夏之風), Huang ordered the establishment of Confucian academies throughout the prefectures, sub-prefectures, and counties in Jiaozhi and appointed scholars to propagate Confucianism ideology.[49] According to the *Records on Annan* (*An Nam Chí Nguyên* 安南志原), fourteen

---

[46] Huang Fu 黃福, "Yu Guangxi Siming fu zhifu Huang Guangcheng" 與廣西思明府知府黃廣成 [Letter to Siming Prefect, Guangxi Province, Huang Guangcheng], in *Huangming jingshi wenbian, juan* 20.
[47] Huang Fu 黃福, "Yi zhan shou zhiyi feng Chen Erqing" 以戰守之議奉陳貳卿 [Letter to Chen Erqing concerning offensive and defensive military affairs], in *Huangming jingshi wenbian, juan* 20.
[48] *Ming shi, juan* 157, *liezhuan* 45

[49] Ming *Xuanzong shilu* 明宣宗實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Xuanzong Reign] (1438; reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1982), 3: 洪熙元年秋七月戊寅 (July 25, 1425).

prefectural schools 府學 (*fuxue*), thirty-four sub-prefectural 州學 (*zhouxue*) and a hundred and thirteen county schools 縣學 (*xianxue*) were put into operation.[50] The Ming colonial government in Jiaozhi, between 1417 and 1428, also selected outstanding tribute students 貢生 (*gongsheng*) each year and sent them to the Directorate of Education 國子監 (*guozijian*) in the imperial capital for further education. There were a hundred and sixty-one tribute students sent to the imperial capital throughout the colonial period.[51] Thousands of local skilled craftsmen were also recruited and sent to the imperial capital. Besides spreading "orthodox" ideology in Jiaozhi, Ming officials exerted cultural influence on the indigenous population by regulating and sinicizing local ritual practices.

While Huang Fu proved dedicated to constructing a glorious colony in Jiaozhi as a testament to the greatness of the Ming Empire, the indigenous colonized people's dislike for Ming rule led them to stubbornly resist Huang's government. The most challenging rebellion, the one that brought an end to the Ming presence in Jiaozhi, was the Lam Sơn Uprising (Khởi nghĩa Lam Sơn 起義藍山) (1418-1427) led by Lê Lợi 黎利 (1385-1433).[52] Initially a participant in Trần Quý Khoáng's rebellion in 1409, Lê Lợi, a wealthy man from Thanh Hóa, later served as a Ming Local Inspector 巡檢 (*xunjian*). Ultimately, in 1418, Lê Lợi declared himself the Pacifying King (Bình Định Vương 平定王) and rose against Ming rule.[53] In response, Huang Fu coordinated with the Marquis of Fengcheng 豐城侯 Li Bin 李彬 (1361-1422), Ming highest military general in Jiaozhi after Zhang Fu was recalled in 1416, and nearly put down the rebellion in its initial phase. However, the complex terrain in Jiaozhi with its

---

[50] *An Nam Chi Nguyên* 安南志原 [Records on Annan] (1419; reprint, Hanoi: The École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1931), 107.
[51] *An Nam Chi Nguyên*, 107.
[52] *Ming taizong shilu*, 196: 永樂十六年春正月甲寅 (February 8, 1418).
[53] *Ming taizong shilu*, 196: 永樂十六年春正月甲寅 (February 8, 1418).

twisty mountains and maze-filled jungle provided Lê forces with enough hiding places to keep them from being annihilated. Over the next several years, Lê's forces continuously harassed Ming administrative offices and disrupted the operations of Ming garrison troops. When the tough Yongle Emperor passed away in 1424, Lê took advantage of the power vacuum left at the Ming imperial court and launched another series of assaults against Ming colonial control in Jiaozhi. Many indigenous people responded to Lê's call and the rebellion reached an unprecedented scale. In response to the turmoil, the new and indecisive Hongxi 洪熙 Emperor (r. 1424-1425) recalled Huang Fu to Beijing thus largely abandoning Ming efforts to incorporate the colony into the empire.[54]

In his later years, in recognition of his dedicated service in Jiaozhi, Huang Fu was promoted to the Supervisor of the Household 詹事 (*zhanshi*) of the Heir Apparent 詹事府 (*zhanshi fu*), where he assisted the man who would later become the Xuande 宣德 Emperor (r. 1425-1435).[55] After the death of the Hongxi Emperor on May 29, 1425, the new emperor ordered his teacher to supervise the construction of a mausoleum for the dead emperor.[56] Unlike his tough grandfather, who was obsessed by passionate expansionism, the Xuande Emperor was indifferent to the idea of colonial expansion and felt little interest in continuing to engage with this stubborn and troublesome colony. Yet even so, in an attempt to save Ming credibility, the Xuande Emperor dispatched seventy thousand troops and cavalry to Jiaozhi, captained by the veteran Marquis of Anyuan 安遠侯 Liu Sheng

---

[54] *Ming Renzong shilu* 明仁宗實錄 *[Veritable Records of the Ming Renzong Reign] (1430; reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1963)*, 3: 永樂二十二年九月丙子 (September 26, 1424).

[55] *Ming Renzong shilu*, 5: 永樂二十二年冬十月壬寅 (October 22, 1424).

[56] *Ming Xuanzong shilu*, 9: 洪熙元年九月壬寅 (October 17, 1425).

柳升 (d. 1427).[57] After the disastrous defeat of these Ming troops in 1427, when tens of thousands of Ming elite soldiers died and Liu was killed in battle, the Xuande Emperor officially abandoned any further Ming ambitions in Jiaozhi, acknowledged the legitimacy of Trần Cảo 陳暠 (d. 1428) as the new monarch, and granted the late Lê regime (Nhà Hậu Lê 後黎朝) tributeship.

Conclusion

Twenty-two years after the Ming loss of Jiaozhi, the indecisive Zhengtong 正統 Emperor (r. 1435-1449, 1457-1465), who was swindled by the vain eunuch Wang Zhen 王振 (d. 1449) to lead troops to subjugate the Mongols, was captured at the Tumu Fortress in 1449. The Tumu Crisis nearly wiped out Ming elite bureaucrats such as Zhang Fu, the Duke of Ying, Minister of War 兵部尚書 (*bingbu shangshu*) Kuang Ye 鄺埜 (1385-1449), and Minister of Revenue 戶部尚書 (*hubu shangshu*) Wang Zuo 王佐 (1384-1449) and resulted in the sacrifice of hundreds of thousands of elite troops.[58] The imperial succession crisis that followed came after a long and inconclusive series of campaigns in the borderlands, including the Luchuan-Pingmian Campaigns 麓川之役 (1436-1449) against the Mau-Shan chieftain Tho (Si 思) in Yunnan, clashes with the Shan states along the modern Burma-Tai frontier, and the end of expeditions by the Jurchen eunuch Ishiha 亦失哈 as the Ming envoy in northeastern Siberia.[59]

---

[57] *Ming shi, juan* 157, *liezhuan* 45.

[58] *Ming shi, juan* 10, *benji* 10, *Yingzong qianji* 英宗前紀 [Record of Yingzong].

[59] See Liew Foon Ming, "The Luchuan-Pingmian Campaigns (1436–1449) in the Light of Official Chinese Historiography," in *Oriens Extremus* 39, no. 2 (1996): 162-203; Jon Fernquest, "Crucible of War: Burma and the

In the eighty-one years between the beginning of the Hongwu Emperor's reign and the capture of the Zhengtong Emperor, the Ming undertook a massive territorial expansion, one not repeated until the middle of the eighteenth century under the Manchu Qing dynasty. To maintain control over this vast territory, the Ming applied different imperial strategies based on local conditions, people, and geography to flexibility construct the Great Ming Empire as an early modern colonial state. In Liaodong, the Ming appeared as a "garrison state" ruling northeastern Eurasia under regional military commission.[60] In the mountainous southwestern, modern-day Guangxi, the Ming government promoted and cooperated with obedient native chieftains 土司 (*tusi*).[61] In Jiaozhi, colonial bureaucratic institutions were put into place and formal provincial-style administration was implemented.

Huang Fu's imperial career in Jiaozhi presents historians with a new image of the early Ming empire. Huang's attempt to transform this new colony into a Ming province—conquest through military domination, administration through formal provincial institutions, and incorporation through cultural sinicization—represent just one manner in which the Ming empire attempted to prove itself an heir to the Great State model in Inner and East Asian history. This essay is not the culmination of my studies of Huang Fu, however, but simply a first step in a larger project about the dual careers of Huang Fu and Zhang Fu, one a famous civilian administrator and one a remarkable military strategist—who are representative of an overlooked group of Ming colonizers in

---

Ming in the Tai Frontier Zone (1382-1454)," *SOAS Bulletin of Burma Research* 4, no.2 (2006): 27-81; Morris Rossabi, "Two Ming Envoys to Inner Asia," *T'oung Pao*, vol. 62 Livr (1976): 1-34.

[60] David M. Robinson, "Chinese Border Garrisons in an International Context, Liaodong under the Early Ming Dynasty," in Peter Lorge and Kaushik Roy, ed. *Chinese and Indian Warfare—From the Classical Age to 1870* (New York: Routledge, 2015), 57–73.

[61] Leo K. Shin. *The Making of the Chinese State Ethnicity and Expansion on the Ming Borderlands* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

the late fourteenth and early fifteenth century. If we are to take seriously their careers and accomplishments—and the nature of the empire they created—we must give some considerable thought and study to the idea of the Great Ming Empire as one of the colonial powers of the early modern world.

Works Cited

CHINESE AND JAPANESE MATERIALS

An Nam Chí Nguyên 安南志原 [Records on Annan] (1419). Reprint: Hanoi: The École française d'Extrême-Orient, 1931.

Đại Việt sử ký toàn thư 大越史記全書 [Complete Annals of Đại Việt] (1697). Reprint, Chongqing: Xi'nan shifandaxue chubanshe, 2005.

Guo Zhenduo 郭振铎 and Zhang Xiaomei 張笑梅, eds. *Yuenan tongshi* 越南通史 [History of Vietnam]. Beijing: Zhongguo renmindaxue chubanshe, 2001.

Huang Fu 黃福. *Feng shi Annan shuicheng riji* 奉使安南水程日記 [Journal of a Voyage on a Mission to Annam]. In *Annan zhuan* 安南傳 [Chronicles of Annam]. Reprint, Taipei: Guangwen shuju, 1969.

———. "Huang Zhongxuan gong wenji" 黃忠宣公文集 [Collected Works of the honorable Huang Zhongxuan (Huang Fu)], 13 *juan*, *bieji* 6 *juan*. In *Siku quanshu cunmu congshu* 四庫全書存目叢書 [Collectanea of Works Mentioned in the *Cunmu* Catalog], edited by Siku quanshu cunmu congshu biancuan weiyuanhui 四庫全書存目叢書編纂委員會. Ji'nan: Qilu shushe, 1997.

———. "Feng zongbingguan Yingguogong" 奉總兵官英國公 [To the Duke of Ying, military commander]. In Chen Zilong 陳子龍, ed. *Huangming jingshi wenbian* 皇明經世文編 [Collected writings about statecraft from the Ming dynasty]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1962.

———. "Yi zhan shou zhiyi feng Chen Erqing" 以戰守之議奉陳貳卿 [Letter to Chen Erqing concerning offensive and defensive military affairs]. In *Huangming jingshi wenbian.*

———. "Yu Guangxi Siming fu zhifu Huang Guangcheng" 與廣西思明府知府黃廣成 [Letter to Siming Prefect, Guangxi Province, Huang Guangcheng]. In *Huangming jingshi wenbian.*

Ming taizu shilu 明太祖實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Taizu Reign] (1418). Reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1955.

Ming taizong shilu 明太宗實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Taizong Reign] (1430). Reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1963.

Ming Renzong shilu 明仁宗實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Renzong Reign] (1430). Reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1963.

Ming *Xuanzong shilu* 明宣宗實錄 [Veritable Records of the Ming Xuanzong Reign] (1438). Reprint, Taipei: Zhongyang yanjiuyuan lishi yuyan yanjiusuo, 1982.

Ming shi 明史 [*History of Ming*] (1739). Reprint, Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1974.

Xu Hong 徐泓. "Ming Beijing xingbu kao" 明北京行部考 [Study on the Beijing Branch Ministry]. *Hanxue yanjiu* 漢學研究, vol. 2, no. 2 (December 1984): 569-598.

Yamamoto Tatsurō 山本達郎, *Annan shi kenkyū: Gen Min ryōchō no Annan seiryaku* 安南史研究：元明兩朝の安南征略 [Study on Annam: Under the conquest of Yuan and Ming]. Vol. 1. Tokyo: Yamakawa, 1950.

WESTERN LANGUAGE MATERIALS

Boxer, C. R. *The Portuguese Seaborne Empire, 1415-1825*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.

Brook, Timothy. "Great States." *Journal of Asian Studies* 75, no. 4 (2016): 957-72.

Farmer, Edward L. *Early Ming Government: The Evolution of Dual Capitals*. Cambridge, MA: East Asian Research Center, Harvard University, 1976.

Fernquest, Jon. "Crucible of War: Burma and the Ming in the Tai Frontier Zone (1382-1454)." *SOAS Bulletin of Burma Research* 4, no.2 (2006): 27-81.

Harrison, Brian. *South-East Asia: A Short History*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan & Co Ltd, 1964.

Harris, Lane J. "The 'Arteries and Veins' of the Imperial Body: The Nature of the Relay and Post Station Systems in the Ming Dynasty, 1368-1644." *Journal of Early Modern History* 19 (2015): 287-310.

———. "Into the Frontiers: The Relay System and Ming Empire in the Borderlands, 1368-1449." *Ming Studies*, 72 (2015): 3-23.

Liew, Foon Ming, "The Luchuan-Pingmian Campaigns (1436–1449) in the Light of Official Chinese Historiography." *Oriens Extremus* 39, no. 2 (1996): 162-203.

Lo, Jung-pang 羅榮邦. "Intervention in Vietnam: A Case Study of the Foreign Policy of the Early Ming Government." *Tsing-hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series, 8: 1-2 (1979): 154–85.

Parry, J. H. *The Spanish Seaborne Empire*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1966.

Robinson, David M. "Chinese Border Garrisons in an International Context, Liaodong under the Early Ming Dynasty," In *Chinese and Indian Warfare—From the Classical Age to 1870*, edited by Peter Lorge and Kaushik Roy, 57–73. New York: Routledge, 2015.

Rossabi, Morris. "Two Ming Envoys to Inner Asia." *T'oung Pao*, vol. 62 Livr (1976): 1-34.

Shin, Leo K. *The Making of the Chinese State Ethnicity and Expansion on the Ming Borderlands.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Wiens, Herold J. *China's March Toward the Tropics: A Discussion of the Southward Penetration of China's Culture, Peoples and Political Control in Relation to the Non-Han-Chinese Peoples of South China and in the Perspective of Historical and Cultural Geography.* Hamden, CT: The Shoe String Press, 1954.

Woodside, Alexander. "Early Ming Expansionism (1406-1427): China's Abortive Conquest of Vietnam." *Papers on China* 17 (1963): 1-37.